

The Review of English Studies

VOL. II.—No. 8.

OCTOBER 1926.

ABRAHAM COWLEY'S *DISCOURSE CONCERNING STYLE*

BY ARTHUR H. NETHERCOT

I

ABRAHAM COWLEY is still known chiefly because his poetry was condemned as "metaphysical" by Dryden, Johnson, and the critics intervening,* and yet at various times, and from various points of view, practically all the classes of his writings have received discussion, from his "conceited" love lyrics and his Pindaric odes, through his learned religious epic (a pioneer in the field) to his plays and his eleven familiar essays.† On the other hand, if he is actually read to-day he is usually read for his prose rather than for his verse; but so far few have noticed that the once-great poet, if he had wished and if he had lived, might have written a kind of prose other than his plays, essays, or even letters (a large collection of which was apparently destroyed by his biographer, Sprat)—and written it well.

In 1685, the English translator of Saint-Évremond's essays prefaced his work with a "Short History of Criticism," naming as the only important English critics Jonson, Spenser, Davenant, Cowley, Rymer, and Dryden.‡ But no one seems to have taken up his challenge, until Dr. Johnson began to write his *Lives of the Poets* in

* Cf. my article, "The Term 'Metaphysical Poets' before Johnson," *M.L.N.*, xxxvii. (1922), 11-17.

† See my articles, "The Reputation of Abraham Cowley, 1660-1800," *P.M.L.A.*, xxxviii. (1923), 588-641; "The Reputation of the 'Metaphysical Poets' during the Age of Johnson and the 'Romantic Revival,'" *Studies in Phil.*, xxii. (1925), 81-132; etc.

‡ See *Essays of John Dryden* (ed. Ker, Oxford, 1900), ii. 313-14.

1778. In two, perhaps three, places, the penetrating old dictator called attention to Cowley's critical power, as follows :

Two *Arts of English Poetry* were written in the days of Elizabeth by Webb and Puttenham, from which something might be learned, and a few hints had been given by Jonson and Cowley ; but Dryden's *Essay on Dramatic Poesy* was the first regular and valuable treatise on the art of writing. . . .

The verses to Davenant, which are vigorously begun, and happily executed, contain some hints of criticism very justly conceived and happily expressed. Cowley's critical abilities have not been sufficiently observed ; the few decisions and remarks which his prefaces and his notes on the *Dauides* supply were at that time accessions to English literature, and show such skill as raises our wish for more examples.*

Again the challenge was neglected. Dr. Johnson's words apparently fell on practically barren soil throughout the rest of the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries, and not until 1901 did any one really attempt to consider Cowley's claims as a critic. Since then at least half a dozen writers have noticed him, chief among their works being Gayley and Scott's sound pages in 1901, Saintsbury's pleasant but rather inaccurate remarks in 1902, Spingarn's valuable discussion in 1908, and G. M. Miller's dissertation-like paragraph in 1913.† Yet none of these accounts is more than two pages long, in spite of the fact that Sprat gave his readers more than a hint when he wrote in 1668 :

This labour about natural science was the perpetual and uninterrupted talk of that obscure part of his life. Besides this, we had persuaded him to look back into his former studies, and to publish a discourse concerning style. In this he had designed to give an account of the proper sorts of writings, that were fit for all manner of arguments, to compare the perfections and imperfections of the authors of antiquity with those of this present age, and to deduce all down to the particular use of the English genius and language. This subject he was very fit to perform : it being most proper for him to be the judge, who had been the best practiser. But he scarce lived to draw the first lines of it. All the footsteps that I can find remaining of it, are only some indigested characters of ancient and modern authors.‡

* See, respectively, "Dryden" in Johnson's *Lives* (ed. Hill, Oxford, 1905), i. 410-11, and "Cowley," i. 38. Note also "Cowley," i. 54.

† See C. N. Gayley and F. N. Scott, *An Intro. to the Methods and Materials of Lit. Crit.* (Boston, 1901), pp. 396-98 ; G. Saintsbury, *A Hist. of Crit. and Lit. Taste in Eur.* (N.Y., 1902), ii. 366-67 ; J. E. Spingarn, *Crit. Essays of the Seventeenth Cent.* (Oxford, 1908), i. xxxv.-vi. ; and G. M. Miller, *The Hist. Point of View in Engl. Lit. Crit. from 1570 to 1770* (Heidelberg, 1913), p. 81.

‡ Sprat, "Account of . . . Cowley," in Spingarn, ii. 142.

But even these fragments, which, like the letters, Sprat deemed it inadvisable to publish, must have perished, for none of Cowley's other editors from Hurd to Grosart and Waller have recovered them.

But, even without them, and without the proposed *Discourse*, is it not possible to adumbrate what Cowley would have written? It will be the purpose of the succeeding discussion, first, to collect and present in a more or less coherent form those critical dicta to which no other student has heretofore paid sufficient attention and which appear in Cowley's prefaces, poems, annotations, essays, and various incidental places such as Sprat's biography; and second, to analyse and evaluate what has been found.

II

Concerning the qualifications and character of the poet himself, Cowley had various remarks to make. He believed that poets, as in the days of antiquity, should be musicians;* but, more important, they should be philosophers and seers. Because of their ancient function of entertaining princes with music and verses upon the greatest and noblest subjects they had always been held in special reverence. His own chief studies, he once remarked, had been in philosophy, wit, eloquence, and poetry.†

Several times he recurred to the proper relationship between philosophy and poetry. Some doctrines—such as the Pythagorean opinion of the transmigration of souls—he held more fitting for the use of poets than of the pure philosophers; and he was always rather sceptical of the value of the highly abstract and speculative flights of metaphysics. Natural philosophy pleased him more, and he recommended that all boys should begin their study in it; later the poet should continue to search into the secrets of divine and human knowledge and to contemplate the whole compass of the creation with sound judgment, diligent observation, and good method to discover its mysteries. He lamented the fact that there were but few good poets who had purposely treated of "solid and learned, that is, Natural Matters" as they deserved.‡

* See *The Complete Works . . . of Abraham Cowley* (ed. Grosart, Chertsey Worthies' Library, Edin., 1881), ii. 86. All following references will be to Grosart, since Waller's later edition omits such material as the Latin works.

† i. 27; ii. 86, 320; i. 141.

‡ ii. 9, 321, 290; and Sprat, in Spingarn, ii. 142.

Closely related in his mind to this subject was that of authority. Too long, he said, had the world possessed the idle and pernicious notion that all things to be found in nature had already been discovered by the ancients—and by Aristotle in particular, the most eminent among them. He honoured Aristotle's "admirable wit and worthy labours," but pointed out that even Aristotle could both deceive and be deceived. The worship of Aristotle had prevented many excellent minds from doing more than expending their whole diligence in commentating on this author, instead of striking out into new paths; for the reasoning faculty as well as the fancy only dreamed when not guided by sensible objects, just as painting by memory and imagination could never produce a picture to the life. The place to go to was nature itself, where the mind might be drawn from words, which were but pictures of the thought, to things, the mind's right object. In these beliefs, Cowley had two masters, Francis Bacon and his own friend Hobbes, both of whom he praised many times. As a result, he stated in several notes that the poet should not rely too much on authority or heap it up pedantically in his works.*

Certain external factors shaping the poet's character were also mentioned by Cowley. For instance, the constitution of the age in which one lived, though a matter beyond one's control, must naturally help to shape what one wrote. Thus a "warlike, various, and a tragical age," though best to write of, was worst to write in. Since there was nothing that required so much serenity and cheerfulness of spirit as poetry, the mind should not be overwhelmed with cares or disturbed with sorrows if one wished to write good poems—a statement which Cowley illustrated by citing the failure of Ovid's *Tristia*. It was, he felt, almost as hard to be a poet in despite of fortune as in despite of nature; and he therefore recommended a cheerful countryside as the only proper place for a poet to work in, adding that one might as well undertake to dance in a crowd as to make good verses in the midst of noise and tumult. City ground, he said, would bear nothing but the nettles and thorns of satire, which grew most naturally in the worst earth.†

Finally, he insisted that when a man had once embarked on the career of poet he must give all his life to it. As he himself had discovered, the man who has set his affections upon the Muse has

* ii. 285; i. 158, 167-169; ii. 24, 19, 30, 74, 151.

† i. cxxvii.-viii.; ii. 321; i. 145.

spoiled himself for all other businesses, and, *vice versa*, if he attempt to devote himself to other businesses he will find that he has spoiled himself for poetry. Nevertheless, he concluded that the faithful servant had his reward, for there was no surer road to immortality than the art of numbers.*

On the general subject of poetry itself, rather than of the poet, Cowley has said a great deal, which is not hard to piece together into a more or less organised whole. In regard to the purpose of poetry he several times referred to Horace, to the effect that it should join true profit with best delight. Though himself agreeing with this double aim in general, he nevertheless inclined to stress one part more than the other; that is, he believed the main end of poetry to be the communication of delight to others.†

The growth of a poem he likened to the creation of the world from chaos, with the initial rising of a rude and unformed hint in the poet's mind, and its development by degrees until the parts and words took their places, and art at length brought them to number, fixed rules, and correspondence. Nevertheless, while realising that the comparison and opposition of art and nature were a commonplace, he confessed his general agreement with Pindar, who preferred the second and called art a crow and nature an eagle. Art, according to Cowley, could never replace or even imitate the full creation of nature or fancy.‡

Some of his suggestions for keeping the poem interesting and varied deserve mention. Horace's rule: *Et quæ desperes tractata nitescere posse, relinquo*; whatsoever business you despair of making shine, omit—he quoted and observed. On the other hand, he advocated taking advantage of a "harmless" poetical license in making additions to one's material if they increased the interest of the poem.§

The appearance of probability, he realised, was of more importance than any adherence to mere fact. So long as a thing sounded true to the reader, no more should be asked. Nor should a poet's real opinion be judged by what he might write, for though often in a dispute one belief might sound more poetical and the other more logical the poet should always choose the one which better fitted his purpose. Like the Scriptures themselves, he should be

* i. 170; ii. 21, 133, 317; i. 29; ii. 24; i. 104.

† ii. 316; i. cxxviii.

‡ ii. 49, 10, 68; i. 169; ii. 23; i. 670, 139; ii. 134.

§ ii. 76, 132, 104.

allowed to speak according to common report, while himself distrusting its basis of truth. Nor did he deem exactness always necessary or desirable in poetry. Poets feigned many things that they did not believe—which perhaps might be the reason that trust was often denied to them because, since they were at times allowed to make fictions, some had abused that liberty. To obviate this scepticism, Cowley supported the use of annotations when necessary, not to make learning ostentatious, but to indicate the truth of some material subject. Similarly, he defended himself against the charge of profanity in exactly reproducing actuality when he caused his characters in a comedy to use Scripture phrases for humorous effect, and gave as his reason the fact that such language was to be found in real life, even though the derision of sacred things was detestable to him.*

On the general subject of language and style he gave several opinions. His interest in the reform of English speech, as shown by the meetings which he held with Sprat, Waller, Clifford, Dryden, the Duke of Buckingham, and others, is well known.† Anecdotes have been preserved concerning the emphasis he put on language and grammar in poetry, in spite of his own youthful refusal to learn such matters according to the rules of his teachers.‡ In his notes, moreover, he discussed such points as the position of an adjective in reference to its noun, and the use or avoidance of certain words like "boy," "lad," and "spouse" in the different "kinds" of writing.§

In general, according to Cowley, the style of contemporary poetry was like syllogisms, where all that was meant was expressed, whereas in ancient days, as in the writings of both Pindar and Isaiah, the fashion of writing was like enthymemes, where half was left out to be supplied by the hearer. Such ellipses, allowing the poet to pass from one thing to another with almost invisible connections, though with the highest and boldest flights of poetry, were—he pointed out—also to be found in Virgil, despite the opinion of Scaliger that the writer had intended later to fill in the gaps.||

"Wit" was a word which occasioned Cowley many reflections, just as it did both his predecessors and his successors. For him it

* ii. 66, 69, 78, 115, 10, 16, 20, 27, 40, 63, 81, 115, 17, 66, 110, 131; i. 176.

† See John Evelyn, Letter to Pepys (1689), *Diary and Corres.* (London, 1881), ii. 311.

‡ Cf. *Tatler*, No. 234, and Grosart, ii. 339.

§ ii. 73, 75, 82.

|| ii. 29, 68.

bore a thousand different shapes, all of which might be comely, although constantly changing. Nevertheless, he felt that false judgment frequently bestowed the title of "wits" too easily, since merely writing verses with five "gouty feet" could not make a man a wit. Rather, a soul must be diffused throughout the work, and reason must control the inferior faculties; wit and fancy were the gift of nature, but they must be tempered by judgment.*

On the other hand, he frequently indicated that wit was not to be considered simply as adornment, as tropes and figures were adornments of speech; and he stated that the number and boldness of conceits, metaphors, and personifications should depend on the nature of the subject. Only weak minds sought out "impertinent similitudes" for everything. Some justifiable hyperboles, for instance, would quickly become absurd if not regarded in a poetical sense; and some figures and allegories were too poetical even for poetry. Clinches and bombast he asserted to be the two crying sins of English verse, for wit was not to be found in puns any more than poetry in anagrams and acrostics. His attitude towards this aspect of wit might well be summed up by his own quotation of Seneca's stricture upon Ovid: *Nescivit quod bene cessit relinquere*—when he met with a fancy that pleased him, he could not find it in his heart ever to have done with it.†

After insisting that true wit must always be joined to the cause of virtue and morality, Cowley gave his final word on the subject thus: wit is chiefly to be defined by negatives; all that can be said in affirmation is that in a true piece of wit all things must be present and yet they must all agree in harmony, without discord or confusion. The definition has some resemblance to Dryden's later one—"a propriety of thoughts and words."‡

Nor did Cowley leave the subject of prosody untouched.§ With his statement that the perfection of poetry was to paint in its numbers the nature of the things it described might well be compared Pope's similar doctrine in the *Essay on Criticism*. According to Cowley, the aim should be to dispose the words and metre so

* i. 135, 142; Sprat, in Spingarn, ii. 130.

† i. 135-136; ii. 320; i. 4; ii. 132-133, 63, 64, 105, 109; i. 184, 216, 221, 26, 125, 110, 115; ii. 20, 38; i. 144-145.

‡ i. 136, 164; ii. 16; i. 135. Dryden, Addison, Johnson, and many others commended Cowley's ideas on wit; and yet certain critics accused him of obscenity in his own love verses. See i. cxxix.

§ Yet T. S. Omond, in *Engl. Metrists* (Oxford, 1921), p. 30, writes: "Cowley's voluminous prefaces ignore it entirely."

that by their order and sound the things themselves might be represented. So far as he had discovered, the English poets, like the Greek, had failed to bind themselves to this principle; but the Latins sometimes did it, and their "prince," Virgil, always. He therefore explained that in his own poetry it was not negligence, or ignorance, but intention, which had produced what sometimes appeared to the unintelligent reader to be stumbling verses; and he advocated following the example of Virgil in leaving lines incomplete when the sense seemed to invite a writer to that liberty, even though neither the English nor the other ancient Latins had left such broken hemistichs. Ovid had approved the practice, though not following it.*

Concerning rhymes Cowley said little. His most interesting advice had to do with "rich rimes," which the French—he said—delighted in. Nevertheless, he would not allow them generally in English—in fact, not at all except in such a free kind of poetry as Pindarics, and even there very sparingly and hardly without a third rhyme to answer to both; for there could be no music on only one note. Chaucer's authority for such rhyming he did not consider sufficient for his new age. Of course, he had no objection to the regular triplet rhyme.†

In general, he said, metre had the advantage of restricting the poet, and of thus preventing a long harangue in prose. Nevertheless, in other passages he insisted that verse should be as free as the sense demanded, for even loose and free prose, such as written by Pliny and Fernelius, bore the authority of an oath when compared with verse. The fact that such an inequality and looseness of number had a nearer affinity with prose than any other kind of English verse and was more fit for all manners of subjects without monotony, led him to choose that style for his translations of Pindar and, especially, Horace. He felt that it was so large and free that it would exalt, not corrupt, contemporary prose, which he and Sprat considered the most useful kind of writing, since it was the style of all business and conversation.‡

To summarise Cowley's more conventional ideas about the poem in general, a paraphrase of one of his extended poetical allegories will suffice. He saw the Muse, the poet's queen, going out in her

* ii. 66, 30; Sprat, ii. 129; Grosart, ii. 64.

† ii. 23; Dryden, in Ker, ii. 229.

‡ ii. 299, 131-132, 4; Sprat, ii. 132, 137.

chariot to take the air. Three pairs of steeds drew her: unruly Fancy was harnessed with strong Judgment; nimble-footed Wit was yoked with smooth-paced Eloquence; and sound Memory companioned young Invention. Nature was the postillion, and Art the driver. Alongside ran the footmen—figures, conceits, sentences, pleasant truths, and useful lies. All things created and uncreated formed the smooth and uninterrupted road; for poetry not only treats of the past, present, and future—that is, of all that is or can be—but also makes creatures and universes of its own. For the Muse speaks in the same style as God Himself, and at her word a new world leaps forth.*

Cowley also left remarks and opinions concerning practically all the classes or "kinds" of literary composition. Epic poetry he considered the chief work that the mind of man might aspire to, and he painted a picture of the typical epic hero. Thus, when the wisest poets sought to set forth an image of heroic worth, they chose some comely prince of heavenly descent and hardened his young virtue in the cold of want and the storms of adverse chance. But after he had seen his friends and kindred murdered and his country in flames, and, fleeing, had undergone adversity on both sea and land, as well as withstanding the angry gods themselves, he at last gained his true birthright. No show on earth, to Cowley, could give so much pleasure as to see great misfortune borne with great courage and decency. The character of such a hero was one of exemplary virtue; he was, in Homer's phrase, "unblamable." Persons of this kind should appear only in epic poems, odes, and tragedies.†

Just as in the epic formula, Cowley advised the heroic poet to follow the example of his predecessors in certain matters. These included the division of the poem into twelve books; the carrying of the hero only so near to the end of the story that all could see it; the beginning with a proposition of the subject and an invocation of some god, these two parts being preferably distinguished according to the Latin method, which in almost all such matters was better to follow than the Greek; and, despite the judgment of Scaliger, the use of digressions and even second invocations, if managed as well as in Homer and Virgil. On the other hand, Cowley would desire certain reforms in the epic. Chief among these was his approval of Davenant's efforts to drive out the gods, witches, devils,

* ii. 17-18.

† i. 144, 162, 176.

monsters, and charms which had formerly made such poetry into a fantastic fairyland, and to replace these by planting men and manners in their stead in such a way as to revivify the past. He also objected to the manner in which Statius and Virgil introduced their evil spirits first in human disguise, but then allowed them to reveal their true origin before they left; for no person is so improper to persuade man to any undertaking as the devil without a disguise. Similarly, Homer's exact repetition of long messages, his catalogues of fleets and armies without descriptions for relief, and other monotonous passages wearied Cowley, although he protested just as heartily at Lucan's excess in the opposite direction. Sometimes, he said, we must be bold to innovate, and run the hazard, like men who venture upon a new coast—a liberty which he himself made use of in inserting an ode into his epic, *Davideis*.*

The most important point, however, in which he thought the epic could be improved, had to do with turning it to religious ends. He felt that poetry, originally a servant of religion, had remained too long in the possession of the devil, where it had been employed at best on the "confused antiquated *Dreams* of senseless *Fables* and *Metamorphoses*." He showed, however, that those "mad" stories of heathen gods and heroes, though seeming so ridiculous now, were actually the whole body, or rather chaos, of the theology of their times. But they, like the tales of the knights errant, were no longer needed for verse, since all the books of the Bible were either already most admirable and exalted pieces of poetry or the best materials in the world for it. He warned only good artists, however, to attempt it, so that they would not abase divinity; indeed, he who could write a profane poem well could write a divine one better. Even such poets, nevertheless, he cautioned as to the difficulty of handling the character and the speech of God, who must talk with simplicity and dignity, as in the Bible itself. He grieved that no one in any language had yet composed poetry according to his ideal, although, it is true, he praised Crashaw for bringing the Muses back to their "true Holy Land." Later in his life, Cowley was called upon to defend himself for having returned to the "leeks and garlic of Egypt" and the "ghosts of antiquated deities" by writing his *Plantarum*, but he ably did so by pleading that anything truly

* i. cxxix.; ii. 62, 68; i. 144; ii. 65, 67, 104, 69. Rymer, in his preface to *Rapin* (Spingarn, ii. 171-172), thoroughly approved of Cowley's conventional principles, but (*ibid.*, ii. 172-173) objected not only to the use of lyrical matters but even more to the presence of lyrical measures.

celebrating the wonderful works of providence was not far from a divine poem.*

Under the head of lyric poetry Cowley undoubtedly considered the ode the most important and interesting form. He satirised writers who thought they had composed an ode when they merely let one line forget itself and run out beyond its neighbour, which stayed at home. His most valuable remarks, however, had to do with the odes of Pindar and his own translations of them. Both of these he described very thoroughly, saying that they would probably not be understood by those who knew only the common roads of poetry, since they belonged to the style which Dionysus Halicarnassus called *Μεγαλοφύης καὶ ἡδὺ μετὰ δεινότητος*, and ascribed to Alcæus. In these poems the digressions were many and sudden, and sometimes long; the poet frequently addressed his own Muse, and often left the reader to find the connection between some of his ideas; the figures were unusual and bold, even to temerity; the versification was various and irregular, and sometimes seemed harsh and uncouth, if the exact measures and cadences were not observed in the pronunciation. But though the manners and numbers were loose and free, the matter was grave. Indeed, he summed up, the enthusiastical dithyrambics of a Pindaric ode were restrained by neither art nor nature, but fell from one thing into another as the extravagance and frenzy of the poet compelled.†

It was in connection with this subject that Cowley discussed the question of translation. If a man should undertake to translate Pindar word for word, he said, it would seem that one mad person had translated another, as even appears when one who does not understand the original reads a verbal rendering into Latin prose. The addition of rhyme alone, without wit and the spirit of poetry, would make it all ten times more distracted than at first. Certain other factors therefore must be considered. For instance, the translator must remember the difference in time between Pindar's age and his own, which, as in pictures, changes the colour of poetry; the difference between the religions and customs of the countries; and a thousand other differences in places, persons, and manners, which appear confusedly at such a distance. Finally, he must recall that

* i. cxxx.-cxxxii., 146, 153; ii. 62, 45; i. 142; ii. 67; i. 131-132. Dennis, in W. H. Durham, *Crit. Essays of the XVIIIth Cent.* (New Haven, 1915), p. 176, agrees with Cowley about God's speech, and Isaac Watts, in A. Chalmers, *Works of the Engl. Poets* (London, 1810), xiii. 16-17, applauds Cowley's entire position.

† i. 208, cxxix.; ii. 316, 5, 14-15, 17; i. 155-156; ii. 327.

the modern ear is a stranger to the music of the original—and sound, especially in songs and odes, sometimes without anything else will almost make an excellent poem. Cowley admitted that though grammarians and critics had laboured to reduce Pindar's verses into regular feet and measures (as they also had for the Greek and Latin comedies) yet those verses in effect remained little better than prose to the modern ear.* Nevertheless, the same thing would be true of an English poem rendered directly into French or Italian. The method, therefore, was to make the translated poet speak English as nearly as possible, and to give the poem an English dress, though even then in the case of Pindar one could not make him richer than he was in his own country, despite all one's wit and invention.†

This same method he advised in some measure to apply to all translations; and he attributed the inferiority of all previous ones to its neglect. This was the reason that the Psalms of David, to his contemporary Hebrews the most exalted pieces of poetry, had failed to be rendered acceptably into English, since even Sandys, and Buchanan, the best translator of them all, had not sought to supply the lost excellences of one language with new ones of the other. As in painting, exact imitation could never produce anything noble or good. Originals in pictures and poetry might at times be more beautiful than nature itself, but copies of these originals never. So Cowley concluded by saying that he did not care whether his libertine way of rendering foreign authors be styled translation, copying, imitation, or any other title, since he aimed at something higher than mere names. The translator should take, leave out, and add what he pleased, in order to reproduce the manner of the original rather than the exact words and to make the new version as natural as possible. This method, Cowley believed, had been scarcely known or practised in England.‡

He regarded amorous poetry variously throughout his life. All poets, he once stated, were expected to pay some duties to love, though we must not necessarily judge their manners from their writings in this vein, as the Italians did of Beza on account of a few lascivious sonnets of his youth. Not in this sense was poetry said to

* This statement brings up the question of whether Cowley understood the consistency in Pindar's irregularity. My opinion is that he did, although there is no absolute proof. Certainly, however, his contemporaries perceived that he was not rendering the true form of Pindar into English. See my note, "The Relation of Cowley's 'Pindarics' to Pindar's Odes," *Mod. Phil.*, xix. (1921), 107-109.

† ii. 4, 327.

‡ ii. 4, 7, 12, 14, 31, 331; *Sprat*, ii. 132.

be a kind of painting : it was not a picture of the poet, but of things and persons he imagined. In his own disposition and practice he might be a Stoic philosopher, and yet speak sometimes with the softness of an amorous Sappho ; indeed, he professed too much the use of fiction to have his testimony taken against himself. On the other hand, every poet should be capable of being in love, and none should be ashamed to be thought in that state. Cowley therefore took the occasion to explain and apologise for any excessive expressions which might have offended " the severity of supercilious Readers " in either his own or others' love verses. Excess is natural in both love and poetry, but one must avoid the two unpardonable vices in both, obscenity and profaneness. Nevertheless, later in his life, Cowley frequently reprehended the celebration of " the follies of Love " and the often " unmanly *Idolizing of Foolish Women* " in verse, despite love's " soft Witchcraft." *

Cowley has concerned himself sufficiently with the drama to merit a separate and more complete discussion of this matter ; and therefore a short resumé of his position will suffice here. He lamented its low estate in his own day, satirising the popular taste for tumblers, maskers, rope-dancers, and show-masters of puppets such as *Nineveh*, and speaking contemptuously of old favourites such as *Musidorus* and the *Spanish Tragedy*. He mourned because contemporary playwrights hesitated to bring forth what they had written, for fear of an evil reception ; and also, being not well pleased that so many English plays were either translated or adapted from foreign languages, he expressed the hope that more Englishmen would use native material and thus show the world the plenty of wit still in England.†

He compared the purpose and characters of tragedy to those of the epic, but had noted that the actors sometimes made it ridiculous by their ranting and postures. He admired tragicomedy, though qualifying his approval by saying that the poet Fate did not end all plays so well as to give them a happy ending after the hero had seemed lost in the middle acts.‡

But comedy was undoubtedly the most to his taste. This type of play he compared to satire (usually styled " biting satire ") in its function of plucking vices and follies, though not persons, out of the

* i. cxxix. ; ii. 45 ; i. 118 ; ii. 290 ; i. cxxx., 145.

† i. 206, 230, 225, 221, 178, 164.

‡ i. 176, 57 ; ii. 342.

sanctuary of any title or office; and he pointed out the stock characters of the comic writers. Defending his own usage, he maintained that if parts for a comedy were to be picked from the ranks of nobles or professionals the most proper to choose were the worst of their kind, since comedy, unlike tragedy, was humble in nature and bred low, so that she did not know how to behave with the great and accomplished. Most comedies, he once remarked, presented the humours of mankind by showing on the stage a day of intrigues (his master was Jonson), the complications of which were always untangled at the last scene; whereas most farces were pieces that always contained a beating, to make them "come off smartly with a twang at the tail." In ancient days, however, comedy held her plebeian rank with so much honour that the great Scipio did not feel that he was debasing himself by occupying himself with her.*

Finally, Cowley believed that comedy could be made a great educational power; and so in his ideal university, in order to infuse knowledge and language simultaneously into the students as part of their apprenticeship to natural philosophy, he planned to have them study the comedians, from whom they were to draw the necessary part of common discourse and the most intimate proprieties of language. Moreover, "as a part of their Recreation and not of their task," he would, every month or two, have them act one of Terence's comedies, advancing later to the plays of Plautus. This would be, for many reasons, one of the best exercises that they could be enjoined and one of the most innocent pleasures they could be allowed.†

Contemporary taste in general, just as in the drama, Cowley felt was poor, and fostered the production of too many worthless writings. In Hebrew times learning was patronised and libraries formed, but the latter contained a few choice authors only; writing, man's spiritual physic, was not then grown to be a disease. So at various times Cowley made fun of ballads, broadsides, and books of emblems, not to mention the fashionable romances. In defending his own work during the Civil War he incidentally explained the reasons for much ephemeral writing.‡

He was inclined to blame the public, however, for much of this situation. As at a play, he said, there were a multitude of readers

* i. 175-176, 208, 36, 204, 203.

† ii. 290.

‡ ii. 51; i. 211, 212, 214, 184, 210; ii. 20, 285; i. cxxviii.-ix.

who were truly and only spectators, without any use of their understanding; and these sometimes were victorious by strength of numbers alone. Others, on the contrary, used their understanding too much, and thought it a sign of weakness or stupidity to let anything pass without attacking it. So Cowley was led to wonder sometimes why poets wrote at all, endeavouring to delight men and yet knowing that their readers would labour just as hard to take offence; the road to fame was indeed defended by rude multitudes of the ignorant and armed troops of the malicious. And again Cowley recurred to ancient times, when men, not neglecting a poet's faults, were more prone to recognise his virtues, and when there were great rewards and encouragements offered to those who excelled in writing.*

Naturally Cowley himself relied much on the "rich help of books"—a fact very evident in the number of references he made to his reading. His admiration for Spenser, to the "chimes" of whose verse he attributed his first interest in poetry, is too well known to need elaboration. However, as he wrote, he soon took three masters among the ancients: Aristotle, the greatest scholar; Cicero, the greatest orator; and Virgil, the greatest poet. The next best poet to the "divine" Virgil he considered to be Horace, with his easy, familiar style. Both of these men were excellent pastoral writers, as the best poets always were. In this class he also praised Theocritus and Hesiod, the latter being the first to write on husbandry and the first poet extant in the world—unless, as Cowley inclined to believe, he and Homer were contemporaries.†

Other ancient writers mentioned frequently by Cowley were Lucretius, whom he called a good poet though at times an ill-natured man; Statius, who had made the story of Thebes so famous in his poem that it was needless to repeat any of the city's history; Ovid, who "once pleased" him; Lucan, Cato, Solon, Catullus, Anacreon, Sallust, Livy, Plutarch, Juvenal, Epicurus, Pindar, Seneca, Thucydides, and many others whom he pictured as now inhabiting Elysium. Of the later Latin writers he described Pliny as an author of unquestioned Latinity, though perhaps too credulous of idle Greek tales; Fernelius as among the moderns of the truest sentiment and no ill master of expression; Boethius; Aquinas; Jerome; Origen; and Cyprian as one who wrote better verse than usual among the Christian poets. The Latins were of course his favourites,

* i. 176-177.

† i. 142; ii. 340; i. 135, 18; ii. 16, 322, 333, 321.

and he naturally believed that a modern education should teach a "proper and ancient Latine." *

Among the modern writers, in addition to Spenser, he mentioned Chaucer as representative of "our old *Poets*" whose authority was no longer to be taken. Of the dramatists he named Shakespeare, Fletcher, and Jonson most often, all of whose works had suffered by being stuffed out with pieces not their own or with the alloy of their own inferior products; therefore, if the care of editing these men belonged to him, he would prune away a fair part of their poems. The wittiest writers of the last age were Jonson and Dr. Donne, and the most learned person was the great Selden. Sidney and D'Urfé depicted shepherds as in the old poetical golden age. He also referred to Montaigne admiringly in several places.†

Of his contemporaries, Crashaw ranked among the highest, as both poet and saint. On the other hand, Cowley jeered at moral writers like Quarles, T. Heywood, Prynne, and Sternhold when they were unable to turn sacred material into true poetry. He referred ambiguously to the wit of Tom Coriat, and commended Lord Broghil's verses and Tuke's comedy. He had an exalted opinion of Davenant's *Gondibert*, which he expected to open new paths in literature. But for no one did he have higher praise than for Mrs. Katherine Philips, the "matchless Orinda," whose verses he predicted would endure longer than Sappho's—partly because of Sappho's obscenity, but more because of her own wit, ease, good sense, fancy, instructive subjects, and excellent numbers.‡

III

It is now possible to evaluate Cowley's critical dicta and to determine his position in the history of English criticism. There is no question that in many respects he was conventional and traditional enough. He was mouthing accepted opinions when he insisted on the exalted, almost divine, nature of poetry, amounting at times to a sort of inspired frenzy; he agreed with his predecessors as to the main features of the epic and of tragedy; he had little new to add concerning the characters and aims of comedy and satire; his

* ii. 335, 9; i. 31, 18; ii. 131-132; 107, 289.

† ii. 23; i. cxxvii., 215, 189, 225; ii. 111, 336, 317, 329.

‡ i. 165, 153-154.

insistence on the necessity of virtue and purity in poetry was partly inherited from the reformers among the early Elizabethans and partly, perhaps, influenced by contemporary Puritanism, though contradicted in some of his own earlier verses; his lament at the low estate of taste, among readers and critics as well as writers, might well have come from the pages of Ascham or Puttenham; his desire to improve the English language through the action of the Royal Society was undoubtedly an outgrowth of the same theories and tendencies as actuated the sixteenth-century Englishman, and as caused the founding of the French Academy; his admirations among classical authors were common to Englishmen of his age and education; and he was humanly faulty enough to accord extravagant praise to his contemporary friends, such as Sam Tuke, Broghil, and Orinda, merely because of their friendship and not because of any great intrinsic ability.

On the other hand, Cowley championed many concepts which were but beginning to make their way and some of which were practically new; some of these linked him with the most clear-sighted and progressive critics in the past and some of them paved the way for the development of criticism in the future; but all of them showed him to be a critic with ideas and a mind of his own, not merely a partisan of either a classical or a romantic or a scientific school of thought. He had the combination of the best qualities of these types, without which no criticism is finally valid. He was objective in his judging of others' works, but he was subjective in his own principles and advice for the future poet. He had both reason and imagination.

Though an ardent admirer of classical literature and to some extent an imitator of it, Cowley was vigorously opposed to authority as the guide and formulator of rules in writing. Bacon was his master in his assault on the repressive influence of Aristotle and his commentators upon literature and thought. Hobbes, with his rationalism, was another. To Pope's admonitions about "Nature and Homer" and his assertion concerning the rules of Aristotle that to "copy nature is to copy them," he would have replied caustically that no man can hope to make himself as rich by "stealing out of others' trunks as by opening and digging new mines." Mimesis should be directly of the thing, with no intervening medium. He would have agreed that reason should control the fancy, but he would have said that both faculties merely dream when not guided by

sensible and observed objects.* Art was a quality indispensable to the best kind of writer, but without Nature it amounted to nothing; Nature—then Art—was the proper order. His attitude toward the so-called rules and principles of Aristotle and Horace was more like the liberal one of Corneille and the younger Dryden—perhaps it was indebted to the freedom and epicureanism of Saint-Évremond, so popular in England; peculiarly enough, however, in one who abode so long in France, Cowley practically never alluded to the French critics other than Scaliger and Montaigne—nor did he make much use of even their critical statements.†

The true scientific spirit actuated Cowley in his attitude toward authority, but this spirit was even more manifest in his treatment of the various external and non-inspirational factors influencing and shaping the poet and his work. In his references to the effects of climate, social environment, age, race, disposition, etc., upon a work of art, Cowley showed himself to be one of the earliest of English critics with any clear appreciation of the psychological and historical point of view (which Miller traces back only to the Harvey-Spenser correspondence) and therefore to belong in the line which eventually led in France to the literary determinism of Taine. Cowley's theory of translation—really of modernisation, even nationalisation, with all the changes in style, material, and versification which the terms would imply—embodies one aspect of his belief.

In regard to the primary aim of poetry, Cowley, in spite of his pronounced moral tendencies as seen in his impassioned advocacy of religious verse and his enthusiastic praise of the Old Testament as poetry (both rather novel conceptions when he first wrote them, despite Saintsbury's statement to the contrary ‡), sided with such men as Sidney, Spenser, and Waller, who, while admitting the didactic side of writing, insisted first of all that it delight. The majority of his predecessors, even his friend Davenant, would have favoured stressing its instructional side, or at least the combination and balance of Horace's two aims; and the crystallised form of Neo-Classical opinion would have done the same. But here again Cowley agreed more closely with Corneille and the younger Dryden. He was careful to assert that poetry was actually or ordinarily

* ii. 285.

† Cf. R. Aldington, "Cowley and the French Epicureans," *New Statesman*, xviii. (Nov. 5, 1921), 133-134. However, Aldington also has no specific evidence.

‡ Saintsbury, *Hist. of Crit.*, ii. 367 n.

fiction, though presented so skilfully as apparently to possess verisimilitude and reality.

In the matter of versification Cowley was so far ahead of his time as not to be understood by most of his contemporaries. Just as he had preached individual liberty in the choice and handling of material, unhampered by authority, he also preached liberty in "numbers." There is no survival in him of the discussion of adapting classical and quantitative measures to English. The form on which he most prided himself was the loose and free one of the Pindaric, which he thought suited to all kinds of subjects because of its untrammelled nature, the easy accommodation of its rimes and metres to the sense of the passage, and its consequent avoidance of monotony. He emphasised the necessity of a good ear in reading it, so that its rhythms would appear, and, though far from claiming any mathematical smoothness, he defended himself against all charges of roughness. Indeed, he and Sprat called attention to its near affinity with prose—an ideal which may be further clarified by recalling his statement that the "loose and free prose" (*libera solutaque oratio*) of Pliny and Fernelius, when "compared with verse," bore "the authority of an oath." It does not require too much of an imagination to say that if Cowley had lived in the second decade of the twentieth century he would have been in the front rank of those fighting in the cause of *vers libre* and even "polyphonic prose"—and practising them.

The statements which he and Sprat have given concerning the desirability of philosophical study and of an intimate knowledge of natural science are very enlightening when made by and about a person who has been recognised as one of the chief followers of John Donne and as one of the most characteristic members of the Metaphysical "school." * It is in these opinions of his maturity—opinions full of a convincing feeling—that we see the true attitude of Cowley toward the widening of the horizon of poetic material—toward a poetry which should be intellectual as well as imaginative, without losing its emotional content. Here is the real "Metaphysical" poet—not in the youthful conceits of fire and ice and hearts and darts in the *Mistress*. No one who has read Cowley attentively can doubt that he repented thoroughly of these juvenile

* Cf. Aldous Huxley, "On the Subject Matter of Poetry," *On the Margin* (London, 1922). Huxley, discussing intellectual poetry and especially Donne, makes the same plea as Cowley, but apparently does not know his predecessor's views.

exuberances and ended with as much contempt for "the monster, woman" * as he once pretended to have devotion. His critical attitude toward "impertinent similitudes," "far-fetcht metaphors," and such adornments of verse was ever one of derision, even while he was writing them. Indeed, his quotation from Seneca concerning the style of Ovid ("when he met with a fancy that pleased him, he could not find it in his heart to quit, or ever have done with it") anticipated the famous "drag-net" comparison which Dryden in 1700 was to apply to Cowley's own inability to "forgive any conceit which came in his way." † Cowley's theory followed the strictures of Sidney, Daniel, Jonson, and the few other early exponents of classical simplicity, who were soon to be attentively listened to by the Neo-Classicists; but his practice in all but a few poems (which to-day are his best remembered) continued in the paths traced by his Elizabethan predecessors in their natural search, as beginners, for decoration and refinement. Bishop Sprat was right when he insisted that in the choice and elegance of his words Cowley "neither went before, nor came after, the use of the age"; but that other bishop, Richard Hurd, whom Cowley also numbered among his editors, was a more able critic when he deplored in his Preface that his author had "generally followed the taste of his time, which was the worst imaginable; and rarely his own, which was naturally excellent."

It was Cowley's misfortune that as a poet he did not have the courage and self-reliance to carry out those liberal and modern principles which he seems to have held as a critic, and which he would undoubtedly have enunciated had he lived to complete his *Discourse concerning Style*.

* See *On the Death of Mr. Crashaw*.

† Dryden, in Ker, ii. 258.

CHAUCER'S COMPLAINTES OF MARS AND OF VENUS

BY G. H. COWLING

I WISH in this short paper to suggest a new meaning for Chaucer's *Complainte of Mars*; and if this be established, a new meaning of the *Complainte of Venus* will follow. Hitherto two opinions have been generally held: the one, based on Shirley's rubric in MS. Trinity R. 3. 20, that the poem is an allegory of a *liaison* of Isabella, Duchess of York, with John Holland, Earl of Huntingdon, written by Chaucer "at the comandement of the renommed and excellent prynce, my lord the Duk John of Lancastre"; the other, to the effect that "noble Geoffroy Chaucier" was incapable of such ungentlemanlike conduct, that there must be some mistake, and that the *Complainte of Mars* is simply a fanciful poem about certain planetary motions.

The poem consists of a Proem followed by a Complainte. The *Proem*, supposed to be narrated by a bird on St. Valentine's Day, tells of the love of Mars for Venus, who completely subjugated the fierce god of war,

And as a maistresse taughte him his lessoun . . .
For she forbad him jelosye at alle,
And crueltee, and bost and tyrannye.

But all good things have an end, and Mars is compelled to leave her and go "into hir nexte paleys." There he waits in solitude for her

For hit stood so, that ilke tyme, no wight
Counseyled him, ne seyde [to] him welcome.

She follows him, and great is their joy in reunion. But alas! Phœbus appears within the palace gates, and Venus rising from her chamber, which was (we are told) decorated with white bulls—the sign of Taurus, flees to the tower of Cyllenius, leaving behind Mars to utter his complaint. The date of their separation was, we are told, the

twelfth day of April. Then follows the *Complainte* of Mars, which consists of an introductory stanza, followed by five lyrics of three stanzas which sing (1) The perfection of Venus, which is the cause of Mars's love; (2) the distress of Venus arising from fear; (3) a complaint that love is torment; (4) love is like the Brooch of Thebes which brings woe on its possessor; (5) therefore, knights and ladies, think not hardly of us nor make jest of our plight, but sympathize with Venus and show her some kindness.

The fiction is based on Ovid's fable (*Metamorphoses*, iv. 170) of the secret love of Mars and Venus, discovered to the gods by Phœbus. The poem is also a fanciful description of a conjunction of the planets Mars and Venus in Taurus, or, in other words, of Mars and Venus visible together in the sky about sunrise in April. Shirley added that the poem was written at the request of John of Gaunt, and that it concerned the Duchess of York and the Earl of Huntingdon; that is to say, that Venus represents Isabella of Castile, the wife of Gaunt's royal brother, Edmund Duke of York, and that Mars represents Sir John Holland, who became Earl of Huntingdon in 1387, and was for a short time later Duke of Exeter. The poem is probably allegorical. That it is a fable we may rule out. It is not told as a mythological fable, and Vulcan is never mentioned.

The conjunction of Mars and Venus is not a very frequent phenomenon, and to one as interested in the aspects of the heavens as was Chaucer, this unusual spectacle might well suggest the making of a poem. If we could discover in what years such conjunctions took place, we might possibly find a clue to the date of the poem. Through the kindness of my friend Mr. R. Stoneley of Leeds, the following problem was sent to Dr. A. C. D. Crommelin of Greenwich Observatory: The planets Mars and Venus were in conjunction when the Sun entered Taurus some time between 1370 and 1400; in what years was this possible? He kindly worked out the calculation on the basis of periods of recurrence, and found that the only possible years were 1383 and 1385; and, of these, 1383 is improbable because the planets were so near the sun that it is doubtful whether they could be seen. So that the year 1385 was the only year in which a conjunction of Mars and Venus in Taurus was likely to impress Chaucer and his fellow-stargazers.*

Shirley's rubric is cryptic in meaning. Isabella of York was,

* This calculation conflicts with that of Professor Thurein, given in Koch, *The Chronology of Chaucer's Writings*, Chaucer Society, 1890.

in the first place, at least as old as Richard II.'s half-brother, Sir John Holland, the son of Joan of Kent, who, after marrying Sir Thomas Holland (*d.* 1360), married again Edward the Black Prince and became the mother of Richard II. True, Walsingham describes her as "mulier mollis et delicata, sed in fine, ut fertur, satis poenitens et conversa," but that offers no hint of Shirley's scandal. No *liaison* with Sir John Holland stains the good name of Isabella of York, and it is possible that Shirley made a mistake in naming the lady. Indeed, if one thinks of the affair in terms of human life, would Chaucer have dared to make a jest of it? With Gaunt and Holland absent in Spain, would Edmund Langley have exacted no retribution from Chaucer for such a reflection upon his honour and the honour of his wife? To me, the supposition that Chaucer intended to mock John Holland and the Duchess of York is incredible.

But I believe that Mars and Venus conceal real names, and that Chaucer's intention was not to mock, but to congratulate, and to apologize for the sin. I think Shirley was right in naming John Holland. Chaucer's ironic allusion to Saint John (l. 9) the apostle of love, and to Mars's "crueltee, and bost and tyrannye" fits this gentleman, who was almost capable of any crime. He tortured a Carmelite friar at Salisbury in most peculiar circumstances in May 1384; and in July 1385 he slew on the Scottish expedition the son of the Earl of Stafford, for which he suffered the loss of two estates and the royal favour, which he did not receive again until after his submission to the King in January, and his reconciliation with Stafford on February 8, 1386. The suggestion has been made* that Chaucer's *Complainte of Mars* refers to a *liaison* between Holland and Isabella of York during his enforced retirement, July 1385 to January 1386, but, as Holland took sanctuary in Beverley, this is unlikely, even if Chaucer dared jest of the King's half-brother and a royal duchess.

But immediately after Holland's pardon, and his return to London he fell madly in love with John of Gaunt's second daughter, Elizabeth. The story, as Armitage-Smith pointed out in his *John of Gaunt*, is told by Malverne, who is usually accurate.

Altera vero (Elizabeth) fuit desponsata comiti Penbroke puero immaturæ ætatis; sed illa viripotens tunc (*i.e.* 1386) effecta, in regalem

* Brusendorff, *The Chaucer Tradition*, p. 267.

curiam est delata ad conspicandum gestus aulicos et mores eorum. Quam ut aspexit dominus Johannes Holand frater domini regis nunc ex parte materna vehementer captus est ejus amore propter quod die noctuque eam sollicitavit tamen per temporum intervalla tandem tam fatue illam allexit sic quod tempore transitus domini ducis patris sui ad mare per eum extitit impregnata. Unde illam incontinenti postea duce acceptante duxit in uxorem ante prolis exortum transivitque in Hispaniam cum illo (Higden, *Polychronicon*, ix. pp. 96-97 *).

In my opinion Chaucer's *Complainte of Mars* refers to this conjunction of Mars and Venus. Elizabeth of Lancaster, one of the children of Gaunt's first wife Blanche, brought up by Chaucer's sister-in-law, Katharine Swynford, had been betrothed on June 24, 1380, to John Hastings, Earl of Pembroke, a ward of Chaucer's friend Sir William Beauchamp, and was nominally the Countess of Pembroke, for in the Middle Ages a betrothal was as binding and as sacred as the ceremony of marriage. In the spring of 1386 Holland, owing to Stafford's murder and its consequences, was boycotted—as Chaucer puts it—

For hit stood so, that ilke tyme, no wight
Counseyled him, ne seyde to him welcome ;

but his ardour, despite his brutal reputation, found favour with Elizabeth—

And she hath take him in subjeccioun,
And as a maistresse taught him his lessoun,

and finally, she was unfaithful to Pembroke. The affair was discovered just before Gaunt's departure on his second expedition to Castile in 1386. The first betrothal to Pembroke was annulled, and the marriage to Holland to save the lady's honour took place immediately. Holland was appointed Constable of Gaunt's Spanish expedition, and the young pair sailed together for Corunna. The situation of the poem fits exactly a meeting of Mars and Venus in London, followed by a further meeting during the course of the progress of the expedition from London to Plymouth in early April 1386, when the state of affairs was discovered by Phœbus (Gaunt). The Duke of Lancaster and his consort, the Queen of Castile, left London and began their royal progress through the southern counties on March 25th ; but the expedition did not sail from Plymouth until July 7th. Before that, the hasty marriage took place.

* Cited and commented on in Armitage-Smith, *John of Gaunt* (London, 1904), p. 459.

These circumstances formed the basis of the poem. Chaucer, recollecting the conjunction of Mars and Venus in 1385, turned the romantic love of the daughter of his patron into something poetic, dignified, and apologetic, by the astronomical fancy with which he invested it. Possibly "the broche of Thebes" is a cryptic allusion to *Elisebeth of Penbroche*. I imagine that the poem was written in 1386 as an apology for the match. Chaucer's intention was not to mock, but to excuse and to compliment. Love was inevitable because the lady was so perfect (l. 174), her distress was pitiful (l. 194), the "broche of Thebes" brought woe, but the cause was not the fault of the brooch (Elizabeth), but of its maker (Gaunt) and of its "coveitour" (Holland) (l. 261).

Chaucer in the last stanza urges pity, and begs his readers not to condemn :

Kytheth therfor on hir som kyndeness.

If this conclusion be true, it will almost necessarily follow that the *Complainte of Venus* refers to the same marriage. Shirley's rubric is to the effect that the poem is a translation from French ballades by Sir Otes de Granson (who was a knight from Savoy, and one of the retinue of John of Gaunt); and further "that Graunsome made this last balade for Venus resembled to my lady of York, answering the complaynt of Mars."

If Shirley remembered wrongly in the former instance, may he not have erred twice? The poem, as I read it, is a defence of a marriage against critics. The lady praises her husband :

In him is bountee, wisdom, governaunce
Wel more than any mannes wit can gesse.

Love is pain, it is true, and she has cause for jealousy, but

No fors I though jalousye me tormente,
Sufficeth me to see him whan I may.

And Love has caused her to

Chese the beste that ever on erthe wente. . . .
To love him best, ne shal I never repente.

The lady, I think, must be Elizabeth, Countess of Huntingdon, and the poem, intended to represent her feelings towards her husband, is another defence of her romantic marriage to Sir John Holland, afterwards Earl of Huntingdon.

Shirley is probably correct in suggesting that the *Venus* is a sequel to the *Mars*. He is correct in stating that Granson wrote the French originals, but he must be wrong in suggesting that they were written to express the sentiments of "my lady of York," or indeed of any other lady, since in their original form they are ballades written by a lover about his lady. Shirley is probably wrong in thinking that "Venus" represented Isabella, Duchess of York, who was the sister of John of Gaunt's wife, Costanza of Castile. Isabella of York died on December 23rd, 1392, soon after Granson's arrival in England. Chaucer must have obtained a copy of some of Granson's ballades; and, seeing in three of them, if turned into an expression of a good wife's sentiments about her husband, an amends for *The Complainte of Mars*, he translated them freely and addressed them probably to Elizabeth, Countess of Huntingdon, the daughter of his patron. Besides paying a pretty and sincere compliment to one of the former pupils of Katharine Swynford, Chaucer probably wished to praise Sir Otes de Granson, who was in England from 1392 to 1396, and received from Richard II. the large annuity of 190 marks.

Lastly, there seems to be an echo of the scandal of Holland's marriage, with a not too friendly rebuke to Katharine Swynford, in *The Doctor's Tale*, C. 72-92.

SIXT BIRCK AND HENRY MEDWALL

DE VERA NOBILITATE

BY A. W. REED

I

THE interest of the Augsburg schoolmaster, Sixt Birck, as a dramatist was first pointed out to English readers in 1883 by Professor Herford, in his chapter on Latin Drama in *The Literary Relations of England and Germany in the Sixteenth Century*. Among Birck's Latin plays was one based on Bonaccorso's treatise, *De Vera Nobilitate*, the theme dramatised by Henry Medwall in *Fulgens and Lucrez*. Professor Herford's reference to Birck's play is brief, and as it is likely to arouse the curiosity of some readers of Medwall to whom the Latin play is not accessible, it may be of interest to them to hear more of it. As Birck was born at Augsburg in 1501, the year in which Medwall is last heard of, there can be no question as to priority. The question that one asks naturally is whether Birck owes anything to Medwall and whether the plays are related or independent. An examination of the Latin school-play shows that it is an entirely independent work. Birck claims in so many words that the idea of dramatising Bonaccorso was original and his own. In his familiar dedicatory epistle he tells us that as a boy he was much interested in a copy rudely printed of the Bonaccorso that he himself owned. It was a companion book of his quiet hours ; and thinking much upon it, it came to him as a new social and political idea that nobility should rest in virtue. In later years, having returned to his native city as headmaster of his old school after sojourning with the humanists of Basel, it occurred to him to make his favourite old book accessible to his scholars in the form of a play ; for since it was his business to train them to be good citizens and wise administrators, he might influence them by this means for good in their tender years.

Birck, Professor Herford tells us, was no mere humanist ; he was also a political Protestant.

His whole life long, he breathed the keen air of political and humanist enthusiasm of which Augsburg and Basel were the most illustrious seats. His dramas vividly reflect this bias. They aim, as he confesses, to train good citizens, to teach the ideals of citizenship, reverence for the parent and care for the child. . . . He crowds his stage with motley figures of every rank and class—counsellors, soldiers, magistrates, servants, artisans, priests, women and children, with the obvious intention of making it an image of the city. He delights above all in pictures of the public procedure of city life—debates in council, banquets in hall, trials in court—always with a marked preference for formal speeches over dialogue. His *Judith* . . . is almost a continuous series of such scenes. . . . The elaborate trial in his *Susanna*, the examination of the three servants in the *Zerobabel*—nay, the very catechism of Eve's "unlike children" in the *Eva*, when they are visited unexpectedly by Jove,* show a kindred taste.

Birck's plays excited the interest of the city. His most famous drama, *Susanna*, was acted in the public garden, "the public *Brunnen* serving for the bath." It was he who established the semi-public vogue of the Latin play in Augsburg; and one of the consequences of his enterprise and initiative was that Nicholas Grimald's Latin "Comedia-tragica" *Christus Redivivus* having attracted attention on the Continent, an Augsburg edition appeared in 1556 from the Press that printed Birck's plays. We have had occasion to note elsewhere (p. 485) the direct influence of Grimald's play upon the Oberammergau Passion Play.

It is clear from Professor Herford's general description of Birck's aims and methods that there was little likelihood of his following the technique of Medwall in his handling of Bonaccorso. To represent a debate in the Senate was forbidden to Medwall, whose company of "players of interludes" was at most four men and two boys; it was an opportunity for Birck. Lucre becomes the arbiter, therefore, in Medwall's play—a bold stroke that sweeps away the whole senate and gives us in its place our first Tudor dramatic heroine; and this it must be noted is mainly the consequence of the limitations imposed on Medwall by his cast. Such a narrowing and intensification of the field of dramatic interest, however admirable in the English play, would have robbed the Augsburg drama of its civic interest; and civic interest, as we have seen, emphasised by the representation of civic ceremonial and corporate decisions, was an essential feature of Birck's dramas. There is, it may be pointed

* The amusing fable of Eve and her children is known to readers of the *Eclogues* of Barclay who took it from Mantuan. The theme was revived by the political or Protestant humanists, including Melancthon.

out, no underplot in the Latin play. Medwall's boys A and B who make love to the maid while Gayus and Cornelius, their masters, make love to Lucrea were apparently unknown, or of no use, to Birck. On the other hand, Birck gets some fun that Medwall missed by introducing the mother of Lucrea, Claudia, whose views on the eligibility of the suitors do not indicate any instinctive preference of mere virtue to wealth. The problems of the two dramatists differed *in toto*. The one was providing an entertainment to be acted by a few players before the guests of a great statesman in the intervals of a banquet; the other was employing as many of his boys as he could make appropriate parts for in a play designed to appeal to the political spirit of the good burghers of Augsburg. A brief examination of Birck's play will make these points more clear.

II

Birck dated the dedication of his play *De Vera Nobilitate* to his friend Christopher Wirsung, February 10, 1538. He tells how he came to be acquainted with Bonaccorso's treatise and his civic and patriotic motives in dramatising it for his boys. The dedication is followed by (1) the *Epistola praeliminaris* of Bonaccorso, beginning :

Apud maiores nostros sæpenumero de nobilitate disputatum est
(1½ pages) and (2) Bonaccorso's *Argumentum* :

Ætate illa florentissima qua inclitum Romanum imperium adolevit,
etc.

The play then opens with a somewhat scholastic dialogue of six pages between Fulgentius, the father, and the suitors, Caius Flaminius and Publius Cornelius, in which the lovers make their proposals for the hand of Lucretia. The scene is closed by a Chorus which sings the praises of the *modestas* of true love :

Est amor castus, Venus est pudica.

The second scene introduces Stichus a servant of Fulgentius, Lucretia and Claudia her mother. Such humour as the play indulges in may be gathered from this scene.

Ful. : Prudens paterfamilias multa cum uxore secreta habet quæ
audiente familia non necesse est effutire. [*Stichus and
Lucretia go aside.*]
Da mihi optuma femina manum.

Cl. : Ubi ea est ? *Quæ* nam ea est optima ?

Ful. : Tu.

Cl. : Tu ne ais ?

Ful. : Si negas nego.

They discuss the problem of the marriage, Claudia urging the importance of money in these matters ; but it is she who suggests that Lucretia be called and that her opinion be taken. Lucretia's reply is definite, *Nobiliorem, pater colendissime, tibi generum facio*. Fulgentius leaves the stage to announce this decision to the young men, and the Chorus closes the scene with an ode which opens significantly :

Felix coniugium consequitur bene
Quæ non divitias sed studium boni
Spectat.

The next scene shows Fulgentius consulting the Consuls, Syllanus and Licinius Muræna, Flavius, the Chief Secretary (*Archigrammateus*), and Tyro, the Crier of the Court (*Præco*). It is agreed that the case shall be submitted to the Senate, and the Chorus shows its approval in lines beginning :

Prudens atque bonus civis, qui publica spectans
Consult ex animo.

In the fourth scene the lovers deliver their orations before the senators, Publius Cornelius occupying their attention for nine pages and Caius Flaminius for nineteen, each closing with a *Dixi*.

In the fifth scene the parties to the suit are asked to leave the Senate House : *Scedite paulisper, dateque patribus consultandi locum* ; and the Senate proceeds to its decision. Each member is asked by the Archigrammateus to give his opinion, beginning with the Consul : *Te, clarissime Consul, rogo super hac controversia quæ inter adolescentes istos de vera nobilitate controvertitur sententiam*. Syllanus gives his decision in favour of Flaminius, and is followed by the rest, some elaborating their reasons, some merely recording a *censeo idem*, but all voting for the worthy man of humble origin. Some fourteen speeches or sentences are delivered, and the Chorus closes the debate.

In the sixth scene the lovers with Fulgentius and Lucretia are summoned to hear the decision. The sentence having first been read aloud by Flavius, the Town Clerk, and confirmed by the Senate, Syllanus the Consul addresses the suitors :

Senatus decretum percepistis ; quare Fulgente (*sic*) splendidissime,
vosque juvenes, tuque in primis pudicissima Lucretia, facile intelligere

uter ex duobus nobilior sit. Flaminium Senatus in æternum præiudicium (*for a lasting precedent*) nobiliorem magno censensu iudicavit; ita tamen O Lucretia, ut tibi præiudicatum non sit, quin optionem integram habeas.

Fulgens thanks the Senate for their pains and industry, and dedicates himself henceforth to their service. Turning to his daughter he asks: *Sed tu mea filia, quem nunc elegisti?* She replies that still she chooses the nobler (*Nobiliorem pater, etiamnum exopto*).

Ful. : Flaminium ergo eligis.

Luc. : Utique.

Fla. : O lepidum diem.

Ful. : Quid ergo prohibet quin sponsalia teste senatu fiant?

Fla. : Nihil ut spero, colendissime Fulgente.

Syll. : Licet.

Fla. : Spondes ergo mihi Lucretiam.

Ful. : Qua dote?

Fla. : Quam tuus tibi magnificus animus suggesserit. Sponde modo.

Ful. : Spondeo ergo vero tibi meam filiam, ac lubens tradoque eam tibi in manus. Consentis Lucretia?

Luc. : Quia sic tibi visum est pater, consentio ex animo.

Ful. : Conueni ergo Flaminio sponso in manus.

At this point of the betrothal ceremony, Cornelius, unable to control himself longer, breaks out:

O Mores! O Secula! O rei indignitatem! Eadem ego fortuna periclitor qua Ajax olim adversus Ulysses!

and apparently he rushes off the stage. Fulgens and his party take leave of the Senate and depart to arrange the day of the marriage, while Calliopiuses addresses the audience:

Valete spectatores et plaudite.

Once more the Chorus chants the praises of modesty, and the play is over.

Birck was an interesting and original dramatist, but he never ceases to be the schoolmaster. He chose his consulate (B.C. 62) and filled his senate with some regard to historical appropriateness. If in so doing he took liberties with Bonaccorso's Ciceronian treatise as great as those taken by Medwall, the boys cast for the parts of the "fathers conscript" learnt more and probably enjoyed themselves no less than the boys who took the parts of A and B in Medwall's *Fulgens and Lucretia*.

LIVES OF ELIZABETHAN SONG COMPOSERS: SOME NEW FACTS

BY CECIL S. EMDEN

THE virtual rediscovery within the last half-century of the works of many of the Elizabethan song composers has provided a tempting field for biographical research. A considerable amount of work has been done in recent years in exploring likely sources of information, so that further attempts to supplement the biographies of the madrigalists and lutenists can hardly be expected to yield more than a miscellaneous assortment of fresh facts. Such being the case, there are collected here a few unpublished details regarding five composers, whose lives extended into the later part of the period usually described as "Elizabethan" by writers on the present subject. With minor exceptions the only connection between the composers mentioned in these notes is the approximate coincidence of their dates. No remarks are included respecting their musical accomplishments and reputations, since these are authoritatively treated in such works as Dr. Fellowes' *English Madrigal Composers* and in works of reference, like Grove's *Dictionary of Music* and the *Dictionary of National Biography*.

In two instances the new facts came to light through references to transactions of the Parliamentary or Commonwealth financial agents, recorded in that mine of historical information, the papers of the Committee for Compounding—papers which comprise reports, affidavits, accounts and the like regarding the compositions paid by "delinquents" in respect of their adherence to the Royalist cause in the Civil War.

MICHAEL EAST

Michael East was probably born about 1580. His song-books prove that he was living at Ely House, Holborn, in 1606, and that he was Master of the Choristers at Lichfield Cathedral in 1618, 1619,

1624 and 1638. Little else seems to have been known of his life. His death has been placed at such widely divergent dates as *circa* 1640 and *circa* 1680.

It appears from the State Papers, Domestic, of the Interregnum, preserved in the Public Record Office (vizt. Volume G.220, Nos. 125 and 131), that the father of one Michael East, of the Close, Lichfield, whose name was also Michael East, had, by his Will, dated January 7, 1647-1648 (proved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury on May 9, 1648), bequeathed £200 to his grandson of the same name. These particulars enabled the Will to be found at Somerset House (P.C.C. 77 Essex). There can be no doubt that it is that of the madrigalist. He described himself as living in the Close, Lichfield; he desired to be buried in the Cathedral churchyard; and he was possessed of landed property in Lichfield and some hundreds of pounds of personal property. Unfortunately no record appears to be preserved at Lichfield of the burials in the Cathedral churchyard until after the Commonwealth period; but the death of this composer can now be fixed at some date between January 7, 1648, and May 9, 1648.

Owing, perhaps, to the fact that the offices of organist and Master of the Choristers were frequently combined, East has been described as organist of Lichfield Cathedral. But it seems to be doubtful whether he was sole organist during the approximate period 1630-1640, since the eminent antiquary Elias Ashmole stated in his life, "by way of Diary", (included in a composite volume, edited by Charles Burman in 1774, p. 290), that "Mr. Henry Hinde, organist of the Cathedral [of Lichfield], who died August 6, 1641, taught me the virginets and organ." The general circumstances and the statement, which follows, to the effect that Ashmole left Lichfield for London on July 2, 1633, suggest that his tuition by Hinde commenced about 1630 or 1631. The explanation may be that East and Hinde officiated at the organ by turns, since it sometimes happened at this period that two Vicars Choral jointly undertook the duties of playing the organ. It is likely that Batten and John Tomkins were so occupied at St. Paul's Cathedral at approximately the same dates as those mentioned above.

In one of the music-books in Lichfield Cathedral Library the name of "Mr. East" appears in a list of Vicars compiled in 1688. His death is there recorded as having taken place on June 2, 1688. This "Mr. East" is no doubt the son of the madrigalist; and

possibly he occupied the same house in the Close as that in which his father resided. The Chapter Books at Lichfield record that "Michael East" was living in "the Choristers House" on June 4, 1661. Shortly after this date "Mr. Easte" is included in a Hearth Tax Return of houses in the Close, Lichfield, with three "hearthes chargeable" (see *Collections for a History of Staffordshire*, William Salt Archaeological Society, 1923 volume, pp. 239-240). It may be, therefore, that the son, bearing the same name as the father, has sometimes been confused with him; and such a confusion may account for the estimate "circa 1680" being given, by Mr. J. A. Fuller-Maitland, for the date of the composer's death, in his article in the *Dictionary of National Biography*.

THOMAS TOMKINS

Much fresh light has lately been thrown on the life of Tomkins by Dr. Fellowes and Sir Ivor Atkins. The results of the former's researches may be found in his book on the *English Madrigal Composers*; and those of the latter's in a publication of the Worcester Historical Society, entitled *The Early Occupants of the Office of Organist and Master of the Choristers of the Cathedral Church of Christ and the Blessed Virgin Mary, Worcester*. Dr. Fellowes suggests that Tomkins was born about 1573; and Sir Ivor Atkins conjectures 1575. The latter observes, on p. 56 of his book, that "the last glimpse we get at Tomkins is from the State Papers (Committee for Compounding, 1643-1660, Part iii. 2132) [the reference is to the Calendar]. . . . In July 1650, a protest from him is recorded 'complaining that demesne lands and tithes in Dodderhill are sequestrated as the Estate of his son Nathaniel, who has no interest therein.' The matter appears to have been satisfactorily settled by September." As a matter of fact there is contained in the original documents in the Public Record Office (State Papers, Domestic, Interregnum, vol. G.236, No. 133) an admission that the reference by the Committee to the "tythes and leases in Doderhill" (on which the summary of the main facts regarding Thomas Tomkins in the Calendar is based) was made in error. The description of the property in question was, on investigation, corrected and stated to include leases by the Dean and Chapter of Worcester, of Leighton Court in the City of Worcester, certain parcels of meadow in Pitchcroft in the City of Worcester, and tithes at Cleeve Prior.

But there is, among the original documents relating to Tomkins, a certificate of the Mayor and Aldermen of Worcester, which contains new and interesting details regarding the composer. Its reference is : State Papers, Domestic, Interregnum, vol. G.124, No. 273 ; and it runs as follows :—

the 17th June, 1650.

To all whom it may concerne

We the Mayor and Aldermen of the Citty of Worcester do by these presents certefy that Thomas Tomkins (late one of the Gentlemen of the late King's Chappell) Being of the age of 78 years : has lived heere very neere 60 yeares. Always reputed an honest quiet peaceable man: conformable to all orders and ordinances of Parliament : and ever since the troubles began has had his constant abiding with us.

(Signed) Tho. Bercrofte Maior
John Cowther
James Taylor
Henry Foord.

This certificate confirms certain assumptions regarding the length of Tomkins' residence in Worcester ; it suggests a careful political attitude on the part of the then venerable musician ; and, finally, fixes the year of his birth at 1572. The certificate is endorsed with a note indicating that Tomkins' petition to the Committee was allowed ; and it may be noted that a certificate of the local committee, dated June 28, 1650 (vol. G.124, No. 283), describes Tomkins as still living " within the precinct of the Colege of Worcester " at that time. The local committee, whose word in the matter is perhaps more reliable than that of the Mayor and Corporation, also certify that Tomkins had been " obedient to orders and ordinances of Parliament."

THOMAS FORD

The death of Thomas Ford happened, as stated by Dr. Fellowes, in November 1648, the composer being buried at St. Margaret's, Westminster. He was one of the musicians of Charles I. and is described in the Lord Chamberlain's Records as musician for the lutes, viols and voices, and composer in the private music for lutes and voices.

No published reference appears to have been made to his will, which is to be found at Somerset House (P.C.C. Essex 173). It is dated November 12, 1648, and was proved on the 20th of that

month. Its contents may be of interest, since they largely comprise bequests to various fellow musicians. The testator gave to Walter Porter, the composer (*circa* 1590-1659, who was Gentleman of the Chapel Royal and Master of the Choristers of Westminster Abbey), ten pounds "in old Gould," "a blacke plush lining figurd, satin and blacke sute," and a half share of his books and of his residue. He gave to Edward Wormall (who was King's musician for the lutes and voices, and who is described by the testator as "my sonne") ten pounds "in old Gould," "my tawny plush lining and sute and my blacke cloake lined with plush," and the other half share of his books and residue. He gave to "Mr. Coggeshall" (who was King's musician for the lutes and voices) his diamond ring. He forgave their debts to "my fellow Drew" and Lewis Evans (both King's musicians for the lutes and voices), as also to "Captaine Cooke" (namely Captain Henry Cooke, who was musician for the lutes and voices, theorbos and virginals, composer in the private music, Master of the Children of the Chapel, composer for the voices, marshal of the Corporation of Musicians, and teacher of several distinguished composers). This last disposition has a particular interest, since it provides some of the earliest evidence of the return of Captain Cooke (a Captain in Charles I.'s army in the Civil War) to the musical profession.

Thomas Day, one of the witnesses of the will, was a Gentleman of the Chapel Royal and Master of the Westminster Choristers. (Many of the particulars and descriptions of appointments of the legatees are taken from the Lord Chamberlain's Records, printed in Lafontaine's *The King's Musick*.)

There are, then, seven contemporary musicians mentioned in Ford's will of 1648—a notable tribute to his close personal relations with his colleagues and an indication of the maintenance of friendly intercourse between the King's musicians for some years after the outbreak of the Civil War.

FRANCIS PILKINGTON

The Reverend Francis Pilkington (*circa* 1563-1638) is known to have been appointed Precentor of Chester Cathedral in 1623, having at an earlier date been ordained to the curacy of Holy Trinity, Chester; but no published biographical statement regarding him appears to note that, according to the Bishop's Act Book at Chester,

he was instituted as Rector of St. Bridget's, Chester, in February 1616, the next institution to St. Bridget's being in September, 1638, "on the death of Francis Pilkington."

MARTIN PEERSON

It has been noticed that Martin Peerson was Master of the Children at St. Paul's Cathedral (a post sometimes held in conjunction with that of almoner) in and about 1636; but it does not seem to have been observed that he is mentioned as almoner of St. Paul's in 1645, in one of the State Papers in the Public Record Office (State Papers, Domestic, Charles I., vol. dxxxix, No. 313 (2)). The paper includes an order by the Puritan "Committee for Pauls" (i.e. St. Paul's Cathedral) to Dr. Burges to pay five pounds to "Mr. Pearson the almoner," who was to deliver up to the doctor the keys of the cloister. The date of order is October 21, 1645, that is to say about two and a half years after an order of Parliament that the property of the Cathedral should be seized and sequestered. Peerson signed a receipt for the money as "Martin Peerson Almoner." The keys were probably required so as to enable possession to be gained of building material in the cloister (see Papers printed by Camden Society, N.S., vol. xxvi, pp. 142-4).

The recipient of the order can be identified as Dr. Cornelius Burges, receiver of the revenues of the cathedral, who, by virtue of orders and ordinances of Parliament of 1643-1645 was appointed "publike lecturer in the church of Pauls, London," displacing the Dean to all intents (see *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum*, 1642-1660, ed. C. H. Firth and R. S. Rait, vol. i., pp. 672-674).

It is evident that, shortly before the above-described transaction between Burges and Peerson, the latter had suffered financially by reason of the sequestration of the cathedral revenues. On August 9, 1644, a petition was presented to Lords and Commons by the Petty Canons, Vicars Choral and other officers of St. Paul's, begging for a retention of their rents and dues, since, having spent their days in the performance of the duties and offices of the Church, and being unfit for other ways of procuring their livelihood, they were likely to be utterly impoverished (Hist. MSS. Commission, 6th Report, p. 22a). The original petition, in the records at the House of Lords, does not show the names of the petitioners; but a draft order, prepared by the petitioners and designed to rectify the matter,

is placed with the petition; and this document proves that the almoner figured with the Petty Canons, Vicars Choral and other officers in protesting their wretched plight.

Biographers of Peerson have remarked that he left a legacy of one hundred pounds to the poor of Marsh in the parish of Dunnington in the Isle of Ely, his will being dated December 26, 1650 (P.C.C. 9 Grey), and proved January 17, 1650-1651. But he also left smaller legacies to the poor of other parishes, including that of St. Gregory by St. Paul's, in which he resided at his death. A feasible inference may, therefore, be drawn that the composer's experiences as almoner evoked the practical sympathy for the poor which is expressed in his generous testamentary dispositions.

Peerson appointed Nathaniel Pownall and John Fox to assist his wife to carry out her duties as executrix under his will. It is not unreasonable to suppose that these gentlemen are identical with the contra-tenor and gospeller in the Chapel Royal, and the King's musician respectively, mentioned in the Lord Chamberlain's Records and the Old Cheque Book of the Chapel Royal (see Lafontaine, *op. cit.*, pp. 84, 118, 125, and *The Old Cheque Book of the Chapel Royal*, Camden Society Publications, N.S., vol. iii. pp. 12 and 78).

Two of the three witnesses of the will were George Latham and Humphrey Moseley. There can be little doubt, in view of the place of Peerson's residence, close to, or in, St. Paul's Churchyard, that these witnesses were the two booksellers of the same names, whose signs were in St. Paul's Churchyard. George Latham plied his trade at the sign of the Brazen Serpent, and also at the sign of the Bishop's Head between 1622 and 1658. He published musical compositions, for instance, John Hilton's *Airs* (1627) and Michael East's *Seventh Set of Books* (1638). Humphrey Moseley's sign was the Prince's Arms, where he carried on business from 1630 to 1661. He was "the chief publisher of the finer literature of his age," including the first collected edition of Milton's *Poems*, early editions of Crashaw, Donne, Vaughan, and others of considerable fame.

The inherent probability, that the composer of earlier years would retain as his associates booksellers and publishers living in his immediate vicinity, has some confirmation in the discovery of Latham and Moseley as witnesses to his will. It should, however, be added that neither of them is known to have acted as his publisher.

MINOR ELIZABETHAN SONNETEERS AND THEIR GREATER PREDECESSORS

BY JANET G. SCOTT

RECENT criticism * of the Elizabethan sonnet leaves us with the general impression that all the poets, greater and lesser alike, went to foreign models, and especially to the Pleiad, for inspiration. It is true that the sonnet is imitative, but to rest content with such a statement is to remain on the edge of the subject.

We might distinguish roughly three periods † in the history of the Elizabethan sonnet :

(1) (Before French influence), including the early writers Sidney and Watson.

(2) (Period of French, Italian and Neo-Latin influence), extending from Barnes to Spenser, that is, comprising all the sonnet collections of the years 1593 to 1596.

(3) (Period of English influence), where we find the minor poets, of whom the chief are Griffin, Smith and Linche.

It was pointed out by Kœppel ‡ that Sidney went straight to Petrarch for suggestions for the phraseology of *Astrophel*. For his *Hecatopathia*, Watson § sought material in the Italians and Neo-Latinists chiefly, while in his *Tears of Fancie* he plagiarised Gascoigne. Barnes' *Parthenophil* contains more allusions to classical mythology than any other sequence. He may have obtained his knowledge either from the classics themselves, or from Italian, French and Neo-Latin poetry, so that it is difficult to state his precise sources. With Lodge, Constable and Daniel, French influence asserts itself, and finds a place side by side with imitation of the Italians. Fletcher's

* Cambridge History, vol. iii. ; Lee, *The French Renaissance in England* ; Lee, *Elizabethan Sonnets*, articles by Professor Kastner, *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, and the *Athenæum*.

† The Scottish sonneteers are left aside.

‡ *Romanische Forschungen*, vol. v.

§ There are a few suggestions from Ronsard also. The distinction made here is true in the gross.

main sources are Neo-Latin, though, in two instances, he does not disdain to translate Ronsard. Drayton * is one of the most uneven, and in certain instances one of the most original, of the sonneteers, so that, while we may get analogues to his poems, it is unlikely that any amount of research will reveal exact sources. Lastly, Spenser's *Amoretti* show the poet more particularly on his Italian side, though there are a few suggestions from Desportes.

When we reach the year 1596, there exists a large body of material in English, and there is evidence to show that Griffin, Smith and Linche were not slow to profit by it. Indeed, they have so slight a poetic gift that they are overpowered by the work of their predecessors. They have read and re-read the sequences published, and just as schoolboys, set to write Latin verse, make some kind of achievement by the aid of hemistichs of Virgil or Horace, so these poets abound in exact reminiscences of *Astrophel and Stella*, *Delia* or *Phillis*. Griffin admired Daniel and Sidney, Smith † Lodge, and Linche ‡ Watson and Spenser. Here are a few examples § of plagiarism in language. I leave aside resemblances of theme, because themes might come from French and Italian, as well as English. The first example, however, shows a resemblance in theme also.

Griffin : *Fidessa*, XX.

"She loves," she saith, "but with a
love not blind."
Her love is counsel that I should not
love ;
But upon virtues, fix a stayed mind.
But what ! This new-coined love,
love doth reprove !
If this be love of which you make such
store ;
Sweet ! love me less, that you may love
me more !

Sidney : *Astrophel and Stella*, LXII.

I joyed ; but straight thus watered
was my wine.
"That love she did, but loved a love
not blind ;
Which would not let me, whom she
loved, decline
From nobler course, fit for my birth
and mind :
And therefore by her love's
authority,
Willed me, these tempests of vain
love to fly ;
And anchor fast myself on Virtue's
shore."
Alas, if this the only metal be
Of love new-coined to help my
beggary :
Dear ! love me not, that ye may love
me more !

* Neither Drayton, Constable nor Barnes has as yet received much scrutiny from source-hunters.

† Smith was probably acquainted also with the translations of Tasso's *Aminta*.

‡ Linche may have been working also with Watson's model, Gascoigne.

§ All quotations are taken from *Elizabethan Sonnets*, 2 vols. ed. Lee (1904).

Griffin : *Fidessa*, I.

Dumb is the message of my hidden
grief,
And store of Speech by silence is
increased ;
O let me die, or purchase some relief !

Smith : *Chloris*, XXXII.

My fixed faith against oblivion fights ;
And I cannot forget her, pretty Elf !
Although she cruel be unto my plights ;
Yet let me rather clean forget myself.

Smith : *Chloris*, XII.

Long hath my sufferance laboured to
enforce
One pearl of pity from her pretty eyes ;
Whilst I, with restless oceans of
remorse,
Bedew the banks where my fair Chloris
lies.

Linche proceeds in the same fashion :

Linche : *Diella*, XVI.

But I must love her, Tigress ! too too
much !
Forced ; must I love ! because I find
none such.

Linche : *Diella*, XXVI.

The love-hurt heart, which tyrant
Cupid wounds,
(proudly insulting o'er his conquered
prey)

Daniel : *Delia*, VIII. (*Elizabethan
Sonnets*, vol. ii.)

And you, mine Eyes ! the agents of
my heart,
Told the dumb message of my
hidden grief :
And oft, with careful tunes, with
silent art,
Did 'treat the cruel Fair to yield
relief.

Lodge : *Phillis*, XXVIII.

And should I leave thee there, thou
pretty elf ?
Nay, first let Damon quite forget
himself.

Lodge : *Phillis*, IV.

Long hath my sufferance laboured to
enforce
One pearl of pity from her pretty eyes,
Whilst I with restless rivers of remorse,
Have bathed the banks where my fair
Phillis lies.

Watson : *Tears of Fancie*, XX.

Hart sighed and bled, eies wept and
gaz'd too much.
Yet must I gaze because I see none
such.

Watson : *Tears of Fancie*, VII.

Now Love triumphed having got the
day,
Proudly insulting, tyrannizing still :
As Hawke that ceazeth on the yeelding
pray.

I append a list of sonnets that may be compared for similar
phrases.

Fidessa.

I.

IV.

VII.

VIII.

IX.

Delia, VIII (vol. ii.).

" VI. "

" VIII. "

" V. "

" XII. "

and Constable, *Diana*, Dec. II., VII.

Fidessa.

- XV. *Delia*, XLIX. (vol. ii.).
 XVIII. *Astrophel and Stella*, LXXXVIII
 XX. *Astrophel and Stella*, LXII.
 XXI. *Astrophel and Stella*, LXIV.
 XXV. compare Horace : *Odes*, I., IV.
 XXVI. *Hecatompithia*, XLVIII.
 XXX. *Delia*, VI. (vol. ii.).
 XXXV. compare Virgil, *Ec.* II., 25.
 XXXVII. *Delia*, II. (vol. i.).
 XXXIX. *Amoretti*, LXXXI.
 Hecatompithia, VII. and XXIX. ;
 cf. *Amoretti*, LXIV.
 XLI.* *Delia*, XIV. (vol. ii.).
 XLII. sonnet of impossibilities †
 XLIII. *Hecatompithia*, XXII.
 LV. *Astrophel and Stella*, XLVII.
 and *Amoretti*, LIV.
 LVII. source Desportes : *Diane*, I., XV.
 LVIII. *Astrophel and Stella*, V.
 LX. for device cf. *Astrophel and Stella*, LXXXIX.
 LXII. *Astrophel and Stella*, V.
 and for the device *Astrophel and Stella*, LXXXIX.

Chloris.

- IV. *Phillis*, V.
 VI. based on *Phillis*, XIV.
 IX. *Phillis*, IX.
 X. compare *Fidessa*, XXXV. and Virg. *Ec.* II. 25.
 XII. *Phillis*, IV.
 XX.† Spenser: *The Shepherd's Calendar*.
 XXIV. *Phillis*, XXVII.
 XXXI. " XXVII.
 XXXII. " XXVIII.
 XXXV. " XI.
 XXXVIII. " XXIII.
 XLI. " IV.
 XLV. based on " XXXIII.

Diella.

- III. *Hecatompithia*, VII.
 cf. *Fidessa*, XXXIX. and *Amoretti*, LXIV.
 IV. *Amoretti*, XXI.
 IX. *Amoretti*, XVIII. and XLII.

* Professor Kastner, *Mod. Lang. Review*, vol. iii. p. 268, wishes to give Du Bellay, *Olive*, X. as the source of this sonnet. Griffin's sonnet is modelled on Daniel's, as a comparison of the language shows.

† Compare Flamini, *La lirica toscana del Rinascimento* (1891), pp. 464 sqq.

‡ Noted by H. E. Cory: *Edmund Spenser* (1917).

Diella.

- XIII. for this device cf. in Italian, Serafino f^o. 173 r^o (1548).
in French, Desportes, p. 143 (ed.
Michiels)
in English, Surrey (Tottel's Miscellany,
ed. Chalmers, p. 326).
- XIV. sonnet of impossibilities (see note † on p. 426).
- XVI. *Tears of Fancie*, XX.
- XX. based on *Amoretti*, LVI.
- XXIII. *Tears of Fancie*, LVIII.
- XXVI. *Tears of Fancie*, VII. and LVIII
- XXX. enumeration. Cf. Fletcher, *Licia*, XVII.

THE GROWTH OF THE READING PUBLIC DURING THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY *

BY A. S. COLLINS

II

Inseparable from the growth of the reading public is the spread of education ; the one reacts on the other, for the reader is awake to the greater need of education, and education should create a desire to read. The eighteenth century began well ; the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, founded in 1699, proceeded energetically to set up charity schools for the instruction in reading, writing and the Church catechism of boys and girls from seven to twelve years old. Queen Anne took considerable interest in them, and during her reign and that of George I. they increased and flourished. Mandeville, in a typically perverse and outspoken pamphlet, decried the "enthusiastic passion for charity schools, a kind of distraction the nation hath laboured under for some time." That was in 1723, but a few years later the passion had cooled, and education fell back into the hands of the clergyman in his spare hours and of the village schoolmaster and dame, earning a pittance by teaching the three R's to some half-dozen children. Yet, even so, education remained at a fair level. Thomas Bray, a prominent missionary worker, who had been instrumental in founding the S.P.C.K., had also improved the intellectual resources of the country clergyman by his scheme for establishing parochial libraries in every deanery throughout England and Wales. By his death in 1730 there were eighty ; twenty-three more were added in the next seven years, and the movement continued to make the clergy better informed and more efficient. Nor were the little dame-schools like that kept by Shenstone's schoolmistress without good influence ; and if the upper classes were none too well served by the public schools, they

* Continued from p. 294.

made up for it by employing tutors. Everywhere education was to be had, sufficient to maintain the steady increase in the reading public. Indeed, Johnson wrote of the year 1748 as "a time when so many schemes of education have been projected . . . so many schools opened for general knowledge, and so many lectures in particular sciences attended."*

But one may doubt whether the press is not a more potent educative force than the school. "All foreigners," said Johnson, in the *Idler*, "remark that the knowledge of the common people of England is greater than that of any other vulgar"; † a statement which Voltaire corroborated in 1763. The Doctor held that "this superiority we undoubtedly owe to the rivulets of intelligence which are continually trickling among us, which every one may catch and of which every one partakes"; and when Voltaire said: "C'est que l'état mitoyen est plus riche et plus instruit en Angleterre qu'en France," he meant virtually the same thing. "That general knowledge which now circulates in common talk was in Addison's time rarely to be found," said Johnson; ‡ and its wide diffusion can hardly be credited to the schools. The honour is due to the booksellers who were so enterprising in the work of popularising knowledge. The first edition of Chambers' *Cyclopedia* appeared in 1728, a fifth edition being reached in 1746, and the middle of the century was an age of number books, having "something of a quackish air" in the eyes of Hume, but admirably adapted to please and stimulate the general public. There was first a great run of popular histories issued in weekly numbers, of which the supreme example is Smollett's; to the disgust of Horace Walpole "eleven thousand copies of that trash were instantly sold, while at the same time the University of Oxford ventured to print but two thousand of that inimitable work, Lord Clarendon's life"; § and, indeed, the sale of his sixpenny numbers reached twenty thousand a week, thanks to the efforts of the publishers who "sent down a packet of prospectuses free (with half a crown enclosed) to every parish clerk in the Kingdom, to be distributed by him through the pews of the church." Then came Hill's popular scientific volumes, and in 1770, Walpole noted that "natural history is in fashion." Thus the booksellers educated the public and provided paying work for writers fifty years before

* Preface to the *Preceptor*. *Works*, 1825, v. 211.

† *Idler*, No. 7.

‡ Boswell, *Life*, iv. 217.

§ *Memoirs of the Reign of King George II.*

Brougham and his circle went "education mad" and inaugurated the terrible "march of intellect."

Noteworthy, too, in the third quarter of the century is the abundance of good literature for children, and also the large number of women writers. Dodsley brought out in 1748 his *Preceptor*, "one of the most valuable works for the improvement of young minds that has appeared,"* said Boswell. Newberry both wrote and published his delightful "little penny books, radiant with gold, and rich with bad pictures and flowery and gilt binding," of which were *Giles Gingerbread* and *Goody Two Shoes*; and they were so popular that an edition of many thousands was often sold out during the Christmas holidays.

Juvenile literature was a province to which the female writer tended, but it was by no means her only province. Nothing speaks more eloquently of the advance in social life achieved between 1720 and 1770 than the great improvement in the education of women and the rise of blue-stocking coteries, poor shadows though they were of the Parisian salons. Addison had said of the *Spectator*, that "there are none to whom this paper will be more useful than to the female world,"† and his purpose of diverting the minds of women from the dull routine of sorting ribands, visiting the toyshop, making jellies, and sewing, bore fruit. The "green girl" and her novel became a common theme of weak satire; Lackington, at the end of the century, rejoiced that "by far the greatest part of ladies have now a taste for books,"‡ and Johnson had said in 1778: "All our ladies read now; which is a great extension."§ Many educated women naturally turned to authorship. Mrs. Haywood had her followers in the novel; Mrs. Macaulay was a best-seller among the popular historians; and the learned Mrs. Carter upheld her sex in the realm of scholarship. They had not to wait for a public, since they had grown up with it and were, in fact, evidence of its growth. They came at the right time, and found a good market for their writings great and small. Hannah More alone made a small fortune by her pen.

Meanwhile, coarseness and indecency had been purged from literature as drunkenness, open immorality and brutal manners had been from life. It was a slow process, and the effect of Addison's moral essays was evident in the next generation rather than his own.

* Boswell, *Life*, i. 192.

† *Memoirs*, p. 256.

‡ *Spectator*, No. 10.

§ Boswell, *Life*, iii. 333.

Even after Walpole's time drunkenness was no disgrace, but quite the usual result of a social evening; and in the lower classes the habit of gin-drinking was simply appalling in the middle of the century, when there were said to be seventeen thousand gin-shops within the London "bills of mortality" alone. The mistresses of George I. and George II. were a public scandal, and the Duke of Grafton, when Premier, did not scruple to take his with him to the play. Chesterfield was ahead of his age in his disapproval of gaming and swearing. But manners and morality in the nation as a whole improved steadily in most respects; in certain spheres and certain matters there was a lingering in the old paths and even a step backwards, but the general trend was upward. "A posthumous piece of infidelity, or an amorous novel decorated with luscious copper plates" still continued to find a public as late as 1750; the scandalous memoirs of Lady Vane helped to sell *Peregrine Pickle* in 1752, and Stevenson's *Crazy Tales* appeared as late as 1762.

But such things were becoming the exception. The once inevitable double entendre vanished from the drama, where pleasanter themes and unexceptionable treatment became the rule. Fielding in the thirties continued the old strain, but he was often hissed for his pains,* and by his unbridled abuse of the government brought the stage under a censorship, moral as well as political. The *Gentleman's Magazine*, after the first few years, was a model of propriety; and in the late fifties the reviews lashed relentlessly an immoral book, although their own abuse of one another was often none too decent. Then in 1757, Horace Walpole noted in his memoirs: "Indecent prints were prohibited: the Chief Justice Mansfield caused to be seized at an auction the well-known tale, called the *Woman of Pleasure*."† A few years later Wilkes brought upon himself infamy and legal prosecution by the privately printed *Essay on Woman*. The religious revival set on foot by Wesley ‡ had much to do with hastening the progress of this change, but the change had been ensured ever since Addison's good-humoured advocacy of a more cultured and moral society. Nor is it doubtful

* *Scots Mag.*, 1739: So far is the dirty ribaldry that once could alone please, from being countenanced now, that seldom a double entendre is allowed, three of which if apparent to the spectators would be enough to damn a play of considerable merit.

† *Memoirs of the Reign of King George II.*

‡ Besides affecting literary taste, the religious revival contributed to the growth of the reading public by awakening intellectual interest. The Sunday School movement, given impetus by Raikes of Gloucester in 1780, carried on the work.

that the growing respect for women, and their increasing numbers and importance both in the reading public and the craft of letters were powerful contributory agencies. The writers in 1770 had to be careful not to offend against "the sweetness of female delicacy." Irreligion and immorality were no longer tolerated in the best literature, except for an occasional lapse. Sterne certainly captivated society, but was rebuked by Goldsmith and others for his "bawdy." Hawkesworth was widely condemned in 1773 for the looseness of description and the slights on religion, interwoven into his edition of the South Sea voyages. By 1780 the taint of the Restoration was practically cleansed away.

The increase in the size of the reading public after the middle of the century is very evident. We find Dodsley's *World* in 1753 with a circulation of 2500,* as against the 500 of the *Daily Gazetteer* some twenty years earlier. The first impression of Lord Orrery's *Letters Concerning Swift* (1752) was sold out in a day, and in two years, according to Warburton, 12,000 had been disposed of.† The *Rambler*, while issued periodically, had a sale of only 500,‡ but by his death, Johnson had lived to see ten editions of 1250 copies in London alone. Dodsley sold from twelve to thirteen hundred of Gray's *Odes* (1757) in a month.§ Robertson's *History of Scotland* in 1759 met with "such unbounded applause that before the end of the month he was desired by his booksellers to prepare for a second edition,"|| and that in spite of its clashing with Hume's volume on Mary; before Robertson's death in 1793 it had gone through fourteen editions. The first impression of Horace Walpole's *History of Richard III.* (1769), consisting of 1200, sold so fast that another thousand were arranged for next day; ¶ and in 1776 Gibbon was writing of his first volume: "I am at a loss how to describe the success of the work, without betraying the vanity of the writer. The first impression was exhausted in a few days; a second and third were scarcely equal to the demand." In 1768 Kelly's *False Delicacy* had been remarkable for a sale of ten thousand copies in the season,** while Cumberland's *West Indian* (1771) eclipsed that by a sale of twelve thousand,†† and in 1778, four thousand copies of

* R. Strauss, *Robert Dodsley*, p. 188.

† Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes*, ii. 232 note.

‡ Murphy, *Life of Johnson*, p. 59.

§ Gray, *Letters*, 1884, i. 350.

|| D. Stewart, *Life of Robertson*, p. 169.

¶ *Letters*, ed. Toynbee, vii. 160.

** Forster, *Life of Goldsmith*, ii. 119.

†† D.N.B.

Hannah More's *Percy* were cleared in a fortnight.* Just before 1780 there was the extraordinary and well-sustained popularity of Blair's sermons, for which Strahan paid as much as £600 a volume,† and that had been preceded in 1776 by the sale of thousands of Price's pamphlet on American Independence.‡

And naturally the bigger sales of good literature were paralleled by a yet greater multiplication in the circulation of more popular work. In 1758 Johnson remarked, that "not many years ago the nation was content with one gazette, but now we have not only in the metropolis papers for every morning and every evening, but almost every large town has its weekly historian."§ The stamp tax figures show that the average daily sale of papers grew in the twenty-two years, 1753 to 1775, from 23,673 to 41,615; and despite the imposition of an extra halfpenny in 1776 it had risen in 1780 to 45,422. Journalism, having finally established its claim in 1772 to report Parliamentary debates, had won through to an important and responsible position. The *Public Advertiser* was the impartial publisher of many a great man's views in its letter-columns, and the whole conduct of newspapers was passing into the hands of better-class writers and booksellers, becoming more efficient, dignified and restrained as the political passions of the first decade of George III.'s reign died down. Then, in 1778, Johnson's *Sunday Monitor* came to lure on the reader who might be too busy during the week.||

But neither in the sale of new books, nor in the abundance of periodical literature and of books for children, nor in the prosperous "number" trade is the growth of the public in the third quarter of the century most evident. It was the irrepressible insistence of the provincial, and particularly the Scotch booksellers, in attacking and finally demolishing the claim of the inner circle of the Trade (as the chief booksellers were pleased to call themselves) to perpetual copyright, that showed there was a growing public, because it was the knowledge of a public demand behind them that gave birth to, and justified the attack on, the monopoly. The House of Lords in 1774, in deciding the appeal in *Becket v. Donaldson*, laid it down that the right to perpetual ownership of literary property never had existed in English Common Law; but from 1734 the judges in

* Meakin, *Hannah More*, p. 113.

† Boswell, *Life*, iii. 98.

‡ D.N.B.

§ *Idler*, No. 30.

|| See A. Andrews, *History of British Journalism*.

Chancery had felt sufficiently satisfied of its existence to grant injunctions to restrain the sale of any reprints where the plaintiff could produce a *prima facie* plea of possession, although the book in question was as old an author as Shakespeare. The Trade's claim was far from being undisputed. One Walker, in particular, was a constant invader of these so-called rights, and surreptitious editions of Shakespeare and Milton and others from time to time appeared. It became more and more difficult to suppress them. In 1752 Lord Hardwicke granted an injunction against a proposed and advertised edition of *Paradise Lost* by Walker, only on condition that the case should be brought to a trial at Common Law, and Tonson, the prosecuting bookseller, backed out. An unsuccessful prosecution in Scotland* had weakened the faith of the Trade, and they resorted to underhand bullying, proscription from sales, and every means of oppression of those who tried to break in upon their monopoly.† They initiated in 1758 a collusive action to force from the law a decision in their favour, but the collusion being discerned the case was dismissed undecided, lest such a decision should form an undesirable precedent. Not until they were refused injunctions by the judges in Chancery did they bring their claim to an honest legal trial; and they did so then because they had all to gain and nothing to lose. They won in 1769,‡ only to lose in 1774. The Scotch booksellers stood fast; the Scotch judges in 1773§ sent the English booksellers home with hard words ringing in their ears and advice that the Scotch Common Law was different to English Common Law, if the slipshod judgment of the Court of King's Bench really reflected it. The House of Lords admitted by their decision that that decision had been faulty, and so did a great service to the poorer booksellers, to the reading public, and to literature and knowledge.||

This conquering persistence of the Scotch booksellers can only be accounted for by the fact that the reading public was not getting all that it wanted from the Trade. The public was growing, and it wanted a better and a cheaper supply of books. Nor was it only, nor even chiefly, Scotland that was dissatisfied, for when we speak

* *Millar v. Kincaid*, 1743. See B.M. 816, m. 12 (54).

† *Some Thoughts on the State of Literary Property*, 1764, B.M. 518, K.4 (13).

‡ *Millar v. Taylor*.

§ *Hinton v. Donaldson*, see B.M. 6573, g. 11.

|| See also on copyright, J. Burrow, *Question of Literary Property*, 1774. *Tracts on Literary Property*, 1774, B.M. 515, f. 16.

of the Scotch booksellers we mean those, too, who were established in England, and the greatest of those was Donaldson, an Edinburgh bookseller. It was of the year 1763 that Boswell wrote, that "Mr. Alexander Donaldson had for some time opened a shop in London, and sold his cheap editions of the most popular English books in defiance of the supposed Common Law right of literary property." * Donaldson asserted that his action was in the public interest, and although Johnson, in the first shock, dismissed the plea as a variation of Robin Hood's justification of robbing the rich to give to the poor, he shortly came round to the opinion that the limitation of right was for the good of the public. At any rate the bookselling trade had come to the time when it needed competition. It had been an age of co-operative publishing, which, while the best system for that early stage in the bookselling industry, had its weakness in absence of competition. The greater booksellers did not compete among themselves because it was not sound policy; the lesser could not compete with the greater because they were kept powerless by terrorism and show of law. The monopolists, therefore, had everything their own way, and it is unthinkable that they could be so unselfish as to serve the public as wholeheartedly in a market which was their own preserve as in one where they must face competition. The booksellers never showed themselves men of that character; nor was such unselfishness to be expected of any men.

The booksellers published in 1774 a list of books in various sizes and at different prices in order to show that there was an adequate supply kept in stock at reasonable and graduated prices.† Their opponents had provoked it by a charge of perpetual copyright having led to costly books of poor workmanship. The charge was not groundless, but exaggerated. The booksellers charged as much as they could, but self-interest naturally set a limit and kept the prices fairly down to the needs of the public. Shakespeare's works were sold at prices ranging from six guineas to sixteen shillings; Gay's from ten shillings to two and threepence; *Paradise Lost* from fifty shillings to two shillings, and *Tom Jones* at eighteen and twelve shillings. On the other hand, the three guineas asked for Hawkesworth's edition of *Cook's Voyages* in 1773 had excited general complaint, and the growing demand for cheaper books was shown by the success of the Scotch invaders. Donaldson's shop in the

* Boswell, *Life*, i. 437.

† List of books in different sizes and at different prices, 1774, B.M. 215, i. 4 (97).

Strand considerably undersold the monopolists and prospered; the Scotchman's commercial instinct had perceived that the public was asking for books and was only held back by the existing prices; the fact that his venture anticipated the decision of the House of Lords by some eleven years indicates that the public was growing impatient with the monopolists. The public had cheap and good books from the Trade, but it might have had cheaper and better. It was truly asserted that "the consequence of a free open trade, will be a competition, to print as well and as cheap as possible." And probably, too, the demand was beginning to exceed the power of the monopolists alone to cater for. Thus when the copyright of Hume's *History* was about to expire, Cooke and Parsons entertained the project of duodecimo editions to cut out the octavo edition of Cadell and Longman, the proprietors. But Cadell forestalled them with a similar edition. Both publishers, however, continued with their respective undertakings, and the sale was so great that each easily paid for its expenses.*

From 1774 the lesser booksellers, by the lapse of copyrights, were able openly to serve the public by cheap and convenient reprints, as they had been doing furtively for some years before. The monopolists had, it is true, maintained a fair supply; there had been many good editions of Shakespeare; Dodsley had brought out his *Old Plays* because he found in 1743 that all "except Shakespeare's, Jonson's, and Beaumont and Fletcher's are becoming scarce and extravagantly dear";† Percy had rescued the ballads. But all these editions were more for the upper-class, literary public. They were too expensive and too cumbersome for the humble middle-class reader; and it was the rising importance of the middle class that was the dominant factor in the years round 1774, a factor, said Beaconsfield, which Lord Shelburne was the first great minister to comprehend. The booksellers, however, had been conscious of it for some time with their weekly numbers. Now the spirit was to provide the public with comfortable pocket editions of the English classics, tastefully got up and adorned with engravings by the best artists. There was Bell's edition of the *Poets*, the shrewd homethrust needed to stir the old booksellers into sufficient activity to produce that edition of the *Poets* to which Johnson prefixed the *Lives*. There was, shortly after, Cooke's edition of the *British Poets*,

* Britton and Rees, *Reminiscences of Literary London, 1779-1853*.

† *Proposal in London Evening Post*, March 24, 1743.

of which Leigh Hunt said, speaking of his boyhood: "How I loved those little sixpenny numbers containing whole poets! I doted on their size; I doted on their type, on their ornaments, on their wrappers containing lists of other poets, and on engravings from Kirk. I bought them over and over again; and used to get up select sets that disappeared like buttered crumpets; for I could resist neither giving them away, nor possessing them." * Bell, in partnership with Martin, "sent forth his *British Theatre* to drive out of the market the old octavo editions of Shakespeare's plays, or the cumbrous collections of the works of dramatic authors, from Dryden and Farquhar to Thomson and Colman." † Hazlitt tells us how he came under the spell of Cooke's *Novelists*. And again there was Harrison's *Novelists' Magazine*, in octavo with double columns, similarly stitched in small weekly numbers for sixpence, with engraved embellishments by Stothard and others, which began in 1779, ran into twenty-three good-sized volumes, and of which at one time 12,000 copies of each number were sold weekly.‡ So far had the supply of literature for the people advanced by the last quarter of the century.

Finally, we must note how the growth in the reading public is again marked by the appearance of Lackington, established as a second-hand bookseller in London, selling remainders at half-price in open defiance of the stringent unwritten laws of the Trade. They excluded him from sales, but the public carried him through, and his first catalogue of twelve thousand books appeared in 1779. Well might he say in later years: "When I reflect what prodigious numbers in inferior or reduced situations of life have been effectually benefited, on easy terms, I could almost be vain enough to assert, that I have thereby been highly instrumental in diffusing that general desire for reading, now so prevalent among the inferior orders of society." § Lackington's motto was "small profits, bound by industry, and clasped by economy," and his small profits became a fair fortune because, like Cave and like Donaldson, he had seen what the public wanted, and when the public was given what it wanted, it wanted more and more.

Thus, by the end of the eighteenth century, there was the sound nucleus of a comprehensive reading public in England and Scotland, which was ready in the early years of the next century to respond with

* *Autobiography*.

† Britton and Rees, *Reminiscences*.

‡ Leigh Hunt, *Autobiography*.

§ *Memoirs*, p. 224.

the utmost eagerness to the combination of literary genius and book-selling enterprise, when Constable gave unheard-of prices, and Murray rivalled him for the romantic enchantments of Scott and Byron. When Sir Walter Scott dined, at the height of his fame, at a gentleman's house in London, all the servant maids in the house asked leave to stand in the passage and see him pass. The eighteenth century had sown the seed of that enthusiastic admiration of a man of letters.

THORPE'S TEXT OF SHAKESPEARE'S SONNETS

BY J. A. FORT

THERE are so many passages in Shakespeare's Sonnets which can be legitimately interpreted in more than one way, that textual criticism alone can never fully reveal the story which lies hidden within them, and, as long as editors rely on this method of inquiry only, new commentaries will only mean fresh uncertainties about these lovely but mysterious poems. If we are ever to understand them fully, we must know at least the persons to whom Shakespeare addressed his letters and something of the circumstances under which he wrote them ; and in the absence of documentary evidence bearing on these points, only one method of inquiry is open to commentators, namely, to adopt some hypothesis as to the first of these points and then to test it in every way they can. If the person in question is some one about whom a good many facts are known, the hypothesis can be tested quite severely ; those sonnets which contain indications of the time at which they were composed, will be of special value in this connection.

As for the persons to whom Shakespeare addressed his Sonnets, the Dark Lady will probably always remain a shadowy figure, but the case is different with the Fair Youth, for Sir Sidney Lee's well-known theory that he was the person who historically was Shakespeare's patron in 1593 and 1594, *i.e.* the third Earl of Southampton, is not only probable in itself but becomes more probable the more it is examined. As for the time at which the various poems were written, Sonnet 104 states clearly that it was composed almost exactly three years after the poet and his friend had met for the first time, while Nos. 26 and 107 may possibly contain further marks of time in them, and there are other poems which may eventually be dated approximately.

But if any one adopts this method of inquiry, he finds himself at once face to face with an all-important but most baffling problem :

"Is the order in which Thorpe printed these poems in 1609 the order in which they were composed originally?" The narrative contained in them cannot be fully elucidated until we can read them in their true order, and how are we to determine what their true order is? It is better to say frankly that we shall never be able to answer this question with absolute certainty, but yet there are some tests which we can apply to any arrangement of the poems, and they are fairly rigorous ones: the narrative which emerges from the poems arranged in any particular order must be a connected and a probable one, while it must also be in accordance with the actual facts that are known about the lives of Shakespeare and his friend; any story which does not fulfil these conditions cannot be accepted as the story which really lies hidden in Shakespeare's verses, while any story which does fulfil them cannot be very far from that true story for which we are seeking. Thorpe's order must be judged by the same criteria as any one's else's order for these letters; but yet his text will always stand in a category by itself, for if any reconstructed version of these Sonnets is some day preferred to his, it yet will be only the best available text of them, while if Thorpe's text proves on examination better than others, we shall have every right to hope that it is something more: the fact that he not only secured 152 Sonnets by Shakespeare which had never been published before, together with the *Lover's Complaint*, which is, I shall suggest, connected with the Southampton Sonnets, but that he secured also good texts of these compositions, is a very remarkable phenomenon, and it is hardly to be explained except on the supposition that Thorpe really obtained his material from very authentic sources.

Now there is no need to-day to consider the re-arrangements of these Sonnets which have been made by John Benson, Mr. G. Massey and the Comtesse de Chambrun, but the recent book by the late Dr. Rudolf Fischer (*Shakespeares Sonette*) is so elaborate and ingenious a piece of work, that it is worth while to compare the story which he extracts from the poems by re-arranging them, somewhat carefully with the story that can be disentangled from Thorpe's text. Professor Fischer, as others have done, identifies the story referred to in the Dark Lady sonnets with the episode of the "Stolen Mistress" referred to in Nos. 33 to 42 of the Fair Youth series; then he notes that the story told in the Dark Lady series falls into three phases, one of happiness in which Shakespeare was loved by his mistress, one of anxiety as his patron began to woo the lady for

himself, and finally one of distress and broken friendship when the patron had won the favour of the lady. The Professor argues that the whole story of Shakespeare's intimacy with Southampton (for he identifies the Fair Youth with that nobleman) must be brought into relation with the story contained in the Dark Lady sonnets, and he therefore re-arranges the Fair Youth sonnets so that they may tell a story which also falls into three phases as well as into a fourth phase, a period of reconciliation and renewed friendship between the two men; he then transfers twenty-five of these sonnets to the second series of Thorpe's Collection and re-arranges the poems in that series too. It would be a long task to examine the Professor's reconstruction of Thorpe's text in all its features, for it extends over 182 pages, but it may be said generally that he transfers from the first to the second series of Thorpe's Collection chiefly poems in which there is neither any mark of time nor any indication of the sex of the person addressed; that he moves groups of sonnets, such as the first seventeen of Thorpe's book, to new positions on special grounds; and that he then re-arranges the remaining sonnets of both series according to the sentiments expressed in them, placing all happy poems in the first or fourth of his four phases, and all anxious or sad poems in his second or third phases.

It is clear, then, that Dr. Fischer's theory, like others, is based upon hypotheses, and that the tests of it can only be the plausibility of his re-arrangements and the probability of the story found in his reconstructed text. *Prima facie* the following seem weak points in his reconstruction: Firstly, the fact that the Professor finds it necessary to re-arrange the Dark Lady sonnets freely in order to obtain his principal narrative; secondly, his theory that all poems, which are realistic only in manner, must be placed in the second series, all poems which properly belong to the first series being both realistic and conventional; and thirdly, his view that all the sonnets in Thorpe's Collection except two must be connected with a single episode in the lives of the poet and his patron. As for some of the details of the Professor's reconstruction, typical examples of his work are to be found in his treatment of Nos. 26, 84, 103, 32, 71, 72, which he places together in the first phase of his narrative because of the similarity of their subject-matter, as well as in his treatment of the "Absence" sonnets, from among which he transfers Nos. 27, 28, 43, 50 and 51 to the second series, and of the "Stolen Mistress"

sonnets, from among which he transfers Nos. 33, 34, 35 to that series also. But it is his handling of sonnets 1 to 17 which seems specially to invite criticism, for in the first place he associates No. 126 with them on the ground that it clearly contained originally one more couplet and that that couplet urged Southampton to beget a son (p. 44); then he places all these sonnets in his second phase on the ground that Shakespeare could only have touched on the delicate subject of marriage after he had been acquainted with his friend for some little time; and finally he argues that Nos. 15 to 17 really preceded Nos. 1 to 14, because Shakespeare *first* promised that his friend should find "eternity" from his own verses, and *only then* urged his friend to win "eternity" by begetting a son—as, however, in Nos. 15 and 16 (which the Professor too regards as two halves of one letter), as well as in No. 17, Shakespeare handled both these topics together, the Professor's decision on this point seems an arbitrary one. That he regards No. 33 as having been addressed to a lady, and "thou" as a more intimate form of address than "you," are only minor blemishes in a very thoughtful and important work, but that he regards Nos. 94, 95 and 96 not as rebukes to Southampton on his lax life, but as reproaches addressed to the Dark Lady, seems to be a very definite error of judgment.

The next part of my task is to determine the period of time in which we must place the Professor's narrative, for, though he has hardly touched upon this subject himself, he has given us sufficient data for a full consideration of it. In the first place he regards Nos. 107 and 124 as being later in date than all the other poems, and as having been written respectively in 1603 and 1600. Then he notes correctly (p. 81) that sonnet 104 was written almost exactly three years after the poet and his friend had met for the first time, and he finally dates it (p. 159) as the latest of all the sonnets except Nos. 105, 76, 108, 115, 116, 124 and the two seventeenth-century poems. Thus, though the Professor suggests in two passages that Shakespeare's sonnets may have been written at any time between 1590 and 1598, it is clear that, if we accept his detailed calculations, all of them except eight must in fact be assigned to a period of not more than three years; and two authentic letters of Shakespeare to Southampton will then enable us to narrow the issue before us somewhat closely. For the Dedication to "Venus and Adonis" can only have been written at a time when the poet and his patron were on friendly terms with each other, and the Dedication to "Lucrece"

only when their friendship was both intimate and sincere ; we must therefore place these two letters either in the first or the fourth of the Professor's four phases, while we know that the one was written in April 1593, the other in May 1594. Further, we know that April or May 1596 is the *latest* date that can be assigned to sonnet 104, since Southampton and Shakespeare certainly met in April 1593 in connection with the publication of "Venus and Adonis." So on Dr. Fischer's data we have only three alternatives to consider—144 of these poems must be placed in a period of about three years which ran either from 1591 to 1594, or from 1592 to 1595, or from 1593 to 1596, while sonnet 104, v. 7, shows that the period began in the April of some year. I omit the year 1590 from my calculation because Sir S. Lee has clearly shown that Shakespeare wrote no sonnets before 1591 at the earliest. Dr. Fischer does not make any mention of "The Lover's Complaint."

It is now possible to compare Professor Fischer's narrative with that of Thorpe. If we connect "Lucrece" with the Professor's fourth phase, beginning our calculations with the spring of 1591 or 1592, the reconstructed story is that Shakespeare formed a close friendship with Southampton before, according to Elizabethan ideas, he was an author at all; that he then opposed his patron in a love-affair long and earnestly; that he passed, in consequence, through a period of very keen distress, but was finally again reconciled to his friend; that soon afterwards, however, he abandoned sonnet-writing almost altogether. If, on the other hand, we connect "Venus and Adonis" and "Lucrece" with the first of the Professor's four phases, beginning our calculations with April 1593, we obtain a story which relates the same incidents but which is more probable from the point of view of time—it places the beginning of this drama at a time when Shakespeare had reached the position of a struggling author, and the end of it at a time when, in all probability, the friendship of the poet and his patron really was interrupted. Thorpe's narrative, as I have interpreted it at some length in *The Two Dated Sonnets of Shakespeare*, is as follows: Southampton and Shakespeare met for the first time in connection with the publication of "Venus and Adonis"; Shakespeare wrote the first of these sonnets very soon after that first meeting, and, if we may connect No. 26 with the publication of "Lucrece," he sent twenty-six sonnets to his patron in the year April 1593 to May 1594; he wrote seventy-eight more sonnets between May 1594 and April or May 1596, all these

104 sonnets having been written in an almost unbroken sequence, the friendship of the two men having continued in spite of the incidents of "The Stolen Mistress" and "The Rival Poet," and poems, which represent the various moods of the writer, having been included in the series at very various times. The break in the intimacy of the two men, which is shown in Nos. 98, 100, 101 and 102, coincided roughly in point of time with the beginning of Southampton's long and troubled wooing of Lady Elizabeth Vernon, which lasted in all from September 1595 to August 1598; with the Comtesse de Chambrun, I regard "The Lover's Complaint" as a plea written on behalf of Lady Elizabeth when it seemed possible that Southampton would abandon her, and if that is a true view the poem must be assigned to the year 1597 or thereabouts; I interpret No. 107 as a letter of congratulation to Southampton, written when he was released from the Fleet Prison in February 1599, and if that is correct, Shakespeare then renewed his old friendly correspondence with his patron for a short time. Nos. 117 to 122, however, record a grave difference between the two men, which I refer to the autumn of 1599; while sonnet 126 was possibly written when Southampton was taking an active part in organising the Essex Conspiracy. I believe that the series of letters ended when the Earl was imprisoned in the Tower in February 1601, for his share in that conspiracy.

The reader must decide which of these two narratives he thinks the better, but personally I much prefer the story that was told originally; it is a consistent story and it seems altogether a more probable one than the other, it fits in easily with all known facts in the lives of Southampton and Shakespeare, and it explains the inclusion of "The Lover's Complaint" in Thorpe's publication. But above all it seems to me that the one narrative represents the relations that existed between the poet and his patron in a true light, while the other represents them in quite a false one. The gap between a patron and his protégé was a wide one in Elizabeth's days, and that between a peer and an actor a still wider one. Southampton was a very imperious youth, and Thorpe's narrative, which shows Shakespeare always ready to fall back into a subordinate position, and always yielding readily to his friend until the time of his late sonnets Nos. 123 to 125, seems to me certainly truer to life than Professor Fischer's story of a long contest between a struggling author and a powerful peer. Moreover, I think that

Shakespeare was not only recording his own emotions, but that he meant many of his highly polished poems to reach, as in fact they did reach, the eyes of others besides Southampton.

I hope then that the reader will not yet lose his faith in Thorpe. However much he may have known about the circumstances under which these poems were composed, he was a very clever editor indeed if he constructed his version of them from a disordered mass of undated letters. When we consider the general soundness of his text and that he secured three long-hoarded works of Shakespeare at the same time, surely we may still believe that he obtained his copy almost, if not quite, directly from one or some of the persons whose figures dimly pass across his pleasant pages.

HAU KIOU CHOAAN

By L. F. POWELL

MISS MILNER-BARRY'S "Note on the early literary relations of Oliver Goldsmith and Thomas Percy," * dealing as it does with their common interest in China, has induced me to gather up all the known facts about Percy's first literary venture, including his and Grainger's efforts to launch it. These facts, or most of them, are to be found in two collections of letters: the Grainger-Percy Correspondence, printed by Nichols,† and the Shenstone-Percy Correspondence, edited by Dr. Hans Hecht.‡ It is, I hope, worth while to give the relevant extracts from these collections as a supplement to Miss Milner-Barry's article. I have added Percy's own record, some bibliographical notes, and a few remarks on statements made by Miss Milner-Barry, with which I am not in complete accord.

The first mention of the Chinese novel occurs as early as 1758, in February of which year Grainger wrote to Percy:

I gave G. § that part of your letter to me, which related to Shin-ping-Sin. He did not seem to approve of the manner in which you propose to treat that fair foreigner. He wants a pleasing romance, and you talk of a faithful copy; but he is to write to you, and till then I would not have you begin your *rifacimento*. ||

Later in the same month Grainger writes more fully:

I have talked with Griffiths about the Chinese novel. He tells me there is no occasion for any formal bargain; you are to translate it into good reading English, and he is to pay you fifty guineas for your pains. You are to add notes to explain the more uncommon customs, and are to introduce the whole with a prefatory discourse upon the manner of writing

* *R.E.S.*, vol. ii. (No. 5).

† *Illustrations of the Literary History of the Eighteenth Century*, vol. vii.

‡ *Thomas Percy und William Shenstone* (Quellen und Forschungen, Bd. 103), 1909.

§ Ralph Griffiths.

|| Nichols, *Illustr.*, vii, 249.

in China. For this supernumerary labour he promises to let you have some copies for yourself and friends. I should really have been much pleased if Griffiths would have remitted you, at present, part of the price, but I find, from the best authority, that this is seldom if ever done. I therefore told Griffiths it would be obliging me to let you have part in hand, to animate you in your drudgery. But he replied, "Should any accident happen to your friend, before the version is finished, my money would be lost, as none but Mr. Percy can perform our agreement." In short, after much pro-ing and con-ing, he at last told me, that as soon as the whole MS. was sent him he would remit you the fifty guineas, whereas the custom was never to pay the whole till the last sheet was sent to the press; and, indeed, I myself know this to be true; you must therefore set about Shui-ping-Sin as soon as possible, and when you have finished the first two books dispatch them up. He shall then pay you the half, because the work may be given to the printer.*

Percy adopted Griffiths' suggestion as to the explanatory notes, but apparently did not feel equal to a discourse on Chinese writing.

Grainger wrote again on April 14 :

I have read Griffiths' letter. You must comply with his request, and if the specimen is approved of, you ought forthwith to bind him down to articles.†

From Grainger's next letter, June 27, it is clear that the publisher was beginning to hedge :

I fancy you must have little dependence upon Griffiths. He wants the Chinese to be naturalized, and yet he seems doubtful of the event. Do not go on with him without a positive bargain.‡

As time went on, Griffiths' doubts increased until finally he withdrew. Grainger softened the blow.

On July 20 he wrote :

Griffiths has sent me back the Chinese Lady, and I assure you I like her in her new English garb.§

In his character of general utility man, and in spite of "a variety of distracting business," Grainger lost no time in his endeavours to find a more favourable publisher. On August 1 he told Percy :

As to Shui-ping-Syn, I have mentioned her to Dr. Hawksworth, who desires to be introduced to her; which I have the more readily complied with, as he is intimate with Payne the bookseller, and I know he will be pleased with this Chinese naturalization.||

* Nichols, *Illustr.* vii, p. 250.
§ *Ibid.*, p. 261.

† *Ibid.*, p. 252.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 259.

|| *Ibid.*, p. 263.

The book is not again mentioned in Grainger's letters to Percy until February 17, 1759, when Grainger wrote, for the last time, on the subject :

Dodsley thinks well of the Novel, and I hope I shall bring him to bargain with you for it : next week I shall show him the specimen. Let me know what you expect for your labour.*

This letter evidently brought Percy to London, anxious to come to terms with one of the foremost publishers of the day.

Percy's diary, which is in the British Museum,† provides us with but a meagre record of his work and his negotiations with Dodsley. I subjoin the extracts relating to the novel in chronological order (they are all dated 1759) :

February 5 : Finished the 1st Book of Chinese Novell.

February 6 : Read over the whole MS. of y^e Chinese Novel ; & the Portuguese Part, twice.

February 13 : Wrote some of Novel beginn^d at 2^d Book.

February 26 : Went to M^r Dodsley's ; read to him my Novel.

March 5 : All day at y^e M^r Johnson's & Miss W[illia]m's—Barretti & Dodsley there. Read my Novel.

August 5 : N.B. Sent Dodsley the first Packet, 93 half Sheet of Hauu Kiou Choaan.

Grainger's advice and assistance were at this time no longer available, as he had started on his travels in the preceding April. His place was taken by Shenstone, the intimate friend of Dodsley. Writing to Percy on November 23, 1759, Shenstone says :

I know nothing of y^e Work you now discover yourself to have undertaken,‡ but am very sure I shall be right glad to be favor'd with any Piece of your Publication.§

He writes again on February 15, 1760 :

I have no knowledge yet of y^e Nature of your Chinese Publication.||

By August 11, however, he was able to tell Percy that Dodsley " seems to entertain no doubt, y^t your Chinese novel will excite curiosity." ¶

* Nichols, *Illustr.* vii. 269.

† Add. MS. 32336, foll. 17-23. I am indebted to my friend Mr. P. W. Simpson for these extracts.

‡ Hau Kiou Choaan. PERCY.

§ Thomas Percy and William Shenstone, hrag. Hecht, p. 27.

|| *Ibid.*, p. 31.

¶ *Ibid.*, p. 41.

We hear nothing more from Shenstone of the book until April 1761, when it was in the press. He then returned "The Advertisement prefixed to y^e Fragments of Chinese Poetry, 4th vol. of Chin. Hist.," which Percy had, with customary caution, submitted to him for revision. "I have discovered nothing that it is very material to alter," says Shenstone: he adds, "I want much to see the Chinese Novel." * His curiosity was indeed aroused, for writing to Percy on June 11 he says:

I took y^e Liberty of asking M^r Dodsley for your Chinese Novel, as I knew you were so good to intend me a copy.†

Percy in reply writes, June 20, 1761:

Mr. Dodsley has promised to get up a set of our Chinese History for you as soon as possible. He does not propose to publish before the Meeting of Parliam^t and till then will part with no Copies. But such a Friend as you has a right to be excepted, and therefore may expect by the first Conveyance a set neatly bound. Considered in a Critical Light you will find it a moderate performance, but as it gives us a history of the human mind in China, I hope it will not be altogether unworthy attention.‡

Shenstone's acknowledgement, July 5, 1761, must have given Percy more pain than pleasure:

I have received your Chinese novel, but have not yet had time to read it. 'Tis a neat edition, I see, and I wish you all success. Do you not suppose y^e House of Sussex § a little too pompous in y^e Dedication? or do you mean it should be pompous in Lieu of much other Panegyrick? The six last words § in y^e Dedic^{on} had surely better been omitted. I have hitherto read no farther, and I shew a Confidence in y^e good-nature by making thus free.||

Percy replied on July 16, completely ignoring Shenstone's criticism:

I am obliged to you that you have favoured our Chinese History with your acceptance; after all, it is not a work calculated for you, nor will afford you any pleasure, unless you can be content to give up almost every beauty of composition for the sake of seeing the workings [of] the human mind under all the peculiarities of a Chinese Education. This is the

* Hecht, p. 51.

† *Ibid.*, p. 55.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 55.

§ Percy concludes his Dedication "To the Right Honourable the Countess of Sussex" with these words: "One reward of my labours I have already obtained, in the opportunity they afford me of acknowledging the great obligations I am under to the House of SUSSEX, and to your LADYSHIP in particular, and of pouring forth every ardent wish for the happiness and welfare of that noble family, to which I owe so much."

|| Hecht, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

only merit the book lays claim to, and . . . sufficient in my opinion to warrant its publication and intitle [it] to the Notice of the world.*

Shenstone's studied opinion of the book completes the series of extracts. It is dated September 1761. After telling Percy that he had read his book and that "L^{dy} Gough borrowed it, kept it a Fortnight, and read nothing but y^e dedication," he proceeds :

The Novel, tho' in some parts not void of Merit, must certainly draw its chief support from its value as a Curiosity,† or perhaps as an agreeable means of conveying to the generality all they wish or want to know of the Chinese manners and constitution. . . . Your Annotations have great merit, yet, on y^e whole, I can form no Conjecture, what vogue it will obtain.‡

The book was published on November 14,§ under the title :

Hau Kiou Chooan or The Pleasing History. A Translation from the Chinese language. To which are added, i. The Argument or Story of a Chinese Play, ii. A Collection of Chinese Proverbs, and iii. Fragments of Chinese Poetry. In Four Volumes, with notes, London, Printed for R. and J. Dodsley, MDCCLXI.

Percy awkwardly interrupts the story at the end of the third book, vol. 3, p. 179, by inserting "A Collection of Chinese Proverbs and Apothegms." The fourth and concluding book occupies pp. 1-168 of the fourth volume, after which follow "The argument or story of a Chinese play acted at Canton, in the year 1719," || and the Fragments of Chinese Poetry "almost all that have been published in any European language."

The novel was translated from English into French, German and Dutch. The French version was published under the title :

Hau Kiou Chooan, histoire Chinoise, Lyon, 1766,

and was in four volumes, duodecimo. It was made by Eidous, a fertile translator, "plus laborieux qu' exact et élégant," who translated everything from James *On Fevers* to Robertson's *History of America*.¶ According to Wylie (*op. cit. infra*), a new edition was published in 1828.

* Hecht, *op. cit.*, p. 60.

† Sir Walter Scott, writing to John Murray, November 2, 1808, says : "Pray look out for 'Chaoou Kiou Chooau ; or, The Pleasing Chinese History' ; it is a work of equal rarity and curiosity."

‡ Hecht, *op. cit.*, p. 63.

§ Straus, *Robert Dodsley*, 1910, p. 375.

|| This, Percy tells us, was found among Wilkinson's papers.

¶ Quérard, *La France littéraire*, t. 3, p. 14.

The German under that of :

Haoh Kjöh Tschwen, d. i. die Geschichte des Haoh Kjöh, ein chinesischer Roman . . . Leipzig, 1766.

The translator was Chr. Gottlieb von Murr, who had three years before produced a version of Glover's *Medea*.^{*} Völcker (*Bibliotheca sinica*, 1864, p. 12) records an undated edition with the title "Hao-kieou-tchouen," and Wylie (*op. cit. infra*, n. 3) one dated 1869.

The Dutch translation appeared in 1767.[†]

One sentence in Miss Milner-Barry's article has caused me some trouble and added to the revenue of the Post Office. She says :

As first published the book was anonymous, though Percy added a signed dedication and some further documentation in 1764 when doubts had been thrown on the genuineness of the *Pleasing History*.[‡]

The natural inference from this unqualified statement is that Percy published a second edition. I have not been able to discover a copy or any record of a copy. It has indeed been known for a long time that Percy prepared a second edition. We even know that Dodsley promised him ten guineas for it. § Francis Douce knew it and wrote the Advertisement to it in his copy of the 1761 edition. As Douce's note contains much that is of general interest, and is only accessible to those who are privileged to pass through that "simple green baize door" which leads to great treasure, I will give it in full :

The authenticity of this work has been doubted, and an "Extract of a letter from Canton, July 9th, 1763, to James Garland, Esq., of Burlington Street," inserted, to countenance it, at the end of the 2nd edition of *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry*, 1767, pronounced a forgery." || See *Love and Madness*, by Herb. Croft, p. 239 of the edition of 1786. The bishop, however, in a letter to Mr. Croft, gave his "honest word, that the quotation from Mr. Garland's letter was (unless that gentleman imposed on

* Goedeke, *Grundriss z. Geschichte d. deutsche Dichtung*, Bd. 4, Abt. 1 (1916), 149. When will English bibliographers co-operate in the production of a similar work for English Literature ?

† A. Wylie, *Notes on Chinese Literature*, 1867, p. 163.

‡ R.E.S., vol. ii, p. 53.

§ *Percy Sale Catalogue*, 1884, lot 243.

|| The extract is as follows : "As to Hau Kiou Choaan, I inquired among my Chinese acquaintance about it, but without success, until I happen'd by chance to mention the Hero of the Story *Ty-chung-u*, when they immediately knew what I meant, and said in their jargon, 'Truly have so fashion man 4 or 500 years before ; have very true Story : How can you *scavez* he.'"

him) genuine and authentic." Upon the strength of this letter, the doctor seems to have actually printed (tho' he never published) a new edition, to which he prefixed the following :

" Advertisement.

" When this little work was first published, it was apprehended that the peculiarities of the composition would so clearly prove it to be a genuine translation from the Chinese language, as to render it unnecessary to mention the names either of the translator, or the editor. But in order to remove any doubt or suspicions arising from that circumstance, the editor has now subscribed his name to the dedication ; and he no longer conceals that of the translator, who was Mr. James Wilkinson, an English merchant, equally respected for his ability and his probity. This gentleman's residence at Canton may be ascertained from the records of the East India company ; and his respectable character is not yet forgotten. His own manuscript was lent to the editor by his nephew, the late Captain Wilkinson, of Bugbroke, near Northampton, to whom it was returned, and it is doubtless at this time in possession of his widow, a very amiable lady,

1774."

Has Miss Milner-Barry in her collection a copy of this edition ? If she has, she is to be congratulated on possessing, I suggest, one of a few copies which escaped destruction.

Percy's absurd reluctance to allow his name to be obtruded on the public is well known.* Moreover, he was not thoroughly convinced of the authenticity of the story, for we find him worried about it in 1797, and again in 1800,† when, a new edition by a Mr. Wright being contemplated, he wrote to Lord Macartney for further proof. It may well be that at the last moment the Bishop's courage failed him, and he withdrew the book containing the signed Dedication from publication.

A question of some importance in connection with this book, which even at this distance of time does not appear to have been satisfactorily settled, is the nationality of the language from which the Wilkinson-Percy translation was made. Percy's account is given in the Preface :

The following translation was found in manuscript, among the papers of a gentleman who had large concerns in the East-India Company, and occasionally resided much at Canton. It is believed by his relations, that he had bestowed considerable attention on the Chinese language, and

* Nichols, *Illustr.*, vol. vii, pp. 711 ; Boswell's *Letters* (ed. Tinker), vol. ii, p. 394 ; Miss Balderston, *History and Sources of Percy's Memoir of Goldsmith*, 1926, p. 29. The list could be extended.

† Nichols, *op. cit.*, vols. vii, 740 and viii, p. 342.

that this translation (or at least part of it) was undertaken by him as a kind of exercise while he was studying it : . . . as the manuscript appears in many places to have been first written with a black-lead pencil, and afterwards more correctly over-written with ink, it should seem to have been drawn up under the direction of a Chinese master or tutor.

He then proceeds to describe the MS. :

The History is contained in four thin folio books or volumes of Chinese paper ; which, after the manner of that Country, are doubled in the fore-edge and cut on the back. The first three volumes are in English : the fourth in Portuguese ; and written in a different hand from the former. This part the Editor hath now translated into our own language.

In a note Percy says : " The Manuscript is dated 1719, which was the last year he spent in China. He died in 1736." But in another place Percy says : " In a blank page of the Translator's MS. of the Chinese History is the following list [of celebrated Chinese poets and painters], dated Canton, 1720." *

This is not entirely satisfactory, and a writer in the *Quarterly Review* of 1829,† who was clearly acquainted with the language, had his doubts of Wilkinson's competence. He wrote :

At the distance of more than one hundred years since . . . no countryman of ours could possibly be competent to the task of translation ; and the work in question appears evidently to have been taken down in great part from the mouth of a native, probably in the imperfect jargon of English spoken at Canton.

In 1867 the Reverend J. Pickford ‡ said, doubtless without much research, that the whole work was translated from the Portuguese by Percy. A quarter of a century later he silently corrected his error by adopting Percy's account.§ Miss Gaussen, Percy's chief biographer, adds to our confusion. She writes :

The work was a translation from a Portuguese MS. of a Chinese novel. . . . The actual translation from the Chinese was executed by Mr. Wilkinson, and Percy merely translated the translator into good English.||

Now, Miss Milner-Barry states, simply and as if it were a well-known fact, that the novel " was a rendering of a Portuguese

* Vol. iv, p. 256.

† Vol. xli, p. 115. Review of J. F. Davis' *Hân Koong Tsew*.

‡ *Life of Percy* in Hales and Furnivall, *Bp. Percy's Folio, MS.*, vol. i, p. xxxii.

§ *Notes and Queries*, 7th ser., vol. xi, p. 505.

|| *Percy, Prelate and Poet*, 1908, p. 24.

translation of a famous Chinese work." * Has she drawn from Percy's account of the MS. the inference that the language of Wilkinson's immediate original was Portuguese? or has she other evidence?

Percy cannot, I think, be entirely ignored. He had access to all Wilkinson's papers; † he had the manuscripts before him; and he had a knowledge of Portuguese. Thus equipped, it is almost incredible that he could have failed to discover the truth; and having discovered it, there does not appear to be any cogent reason for its suppression. Miss Milner-Barry may be right, but it is permissible, I think, to ask on what authority she disregards Percy and disturbs our belief.

It has been suggested by various writers that *Hau Kiou Chooan* influenced Goldsmith in the choice of medium for his *Citizen of the World*. Miss Milner-Barry has dealt with the question fully and sympathetically; the evidence adduced by her is, however, not conclusive. We know that Goldsmith copied extensively from D'Argens' *Lettres chinoises* ‡ and made use of Du Halde.§ We know, too, that he took the name of his Chinese philosopher, "Lien Chi Altangi," from Walpole, || and that of his chief correspondent, "Fum-Hoam," from Gueullette.¶ Moreover, there is other evidence of Goldsmith's Chinese reading prior to his introduction to Percy, February 21, 1759.** There is, I venture to think, little doubt that the works mentioned suggested the medium of Gold-

* *R.E.S.*, vol. ii, p. 52.

† *Hau Kiou Chooan*, vol. i, Pref. p. xxvii. Percy retains the translator's notes on Chinese words, names, measures, customs, relationships, etc.

‡ Crane and Smith, *A French Influence on Goldsmith's "Citizen of the World,"* *Mod. Phil.*, vol. xix. An important article which Miss Milner-Barry has not, I think, consulted.

§ Goldsmith also laid Montesquieu's *Lettres persanes* and Lyttelton's imitation under contribution.

|| *A letter from Xo-Ho, a Chinese Philosopher at London, to his friend Lien Chi at Peking, 1757.*

¶ *Aventures merveilleuses du Mandarin Fum-Hoam: contes chinois.* I owe this reference to Sells, *Les sources françaises de Goldsmith*, p. 98.

** *Letter to Bryanton*, August 14, 1758: "You see I use Chinese names to show my own erudition, as I shall soon make our Chinese talk like an Englishman to show his." Forster, *Goldsmith*, vol. i, p. 139, and referred to in the Index as "a forecast of the *Citizen*." *Letter to Henry Goldsmith*, early in February 1759, in which Goldsmith's views on the evil effects of romance-reading are cited by Miss Milner-Barry as originally derived from Du Halde, *ibid.*, p. 165. *Review of Goguet's De l'origine des loix*, etc., in which Goldsmith signals out for mention "the many valuable particulars concerning the history, manners, government, arts and sciences of the Ancient Chinese." *Critical Review*, March 1759, presumably written in February.

smith's production, and that D'Argens' collection of pseudo-letters served as a model.*

THE PERCY MEMOIR

Miss Milner-Barry states that "it was Percy to whom Goldsmith entrusted materials for his biography, and it was he who lost the papers and bungled the task." † This indictment requires, I think, some modification. It is quite true that Percy obtained valuable materials from Goldsmith, but it is also true that he handed them over to Johnson for use in the life which would, doubtless, have been written "had not," as Malone tells us, "the booksellers from some clashing of interests in the property of Goldsmith's works excluded them from their great collection of English Poetry." ‡ Johnson failed to return the papers, and they were recovered by Malone after his death. § In these circumstances it is hardly just to say that Percy lost them.

THE MATRONS

Miss Milner-Barry states in a note (*R.E.S.*, vol. ii, p. 58), that she has not found *The Matrons* "in any of the bibliographies of Percy's work." She will find the book duly entered or referred to under Percy's name in such standard works of reference as the *Douce Catalogue* (1840), Lowndes *Bibliographer's Manual* (1864), and the *British Museum Catalogue of Printed Books*. According to Straus (*Robert Dodsley*, 1910, p. 377), who also assigns it to Percy, it was published on May 28, 1762.

* D'Argens' *Lettres chinoises* originally appeared as a bi-weekly journal. Martino, *L'Orient dans la littérature française au xvii^e et au xviii^e siècle*, 1906, p. 301. It will be remembered that *The Citizen of the World* was first printed in the form of bi-weekly letters (*Chinese Letters*) in *The Public Ledger*.

† *R.E.S.*, vol. ii, p. 51.

‡ *Trans. Bibliographical Soc.*, vol. xv, 1920, p. 14.

§ Prior, *Goldsmith*, 1837, vol. i, p. x.; Forster, *Goldsmith*, 1877, vol. ii, p. 443; Miss Balderston, *Hist. and Sources of Percy's Memoir*, 1926, p. 23.

the rebellion, attempted in 1599 to recover the office, Curteys appealed for help to Cecil (*Cal. S. P. Ireland*, 1598-9, 484).*

The bill of imprest (or authorisation to draw money in advance) of May 30, 1590, belongs to a year of great interest in the biography of Spenser. It has been usual to suppose that he left Ireland with Raleigh in the autumn of 1589 and did not return till the autumn of 1591. But the bill of May 1590 seems to have been made out to Spenser in person, not to an assignee, as were bills made out to Andrew Colthurst, the assignee of Raleigh in 1588 and 1589 (folio 355). While this document does not prove that Spenser was in Ireland on May 30, 1590, it would seem to throw the burden of proof upon those who maintain the contrary. It is possible that he stayed in England long enough to see the publication of *The Faerie Queene*, and to urge his claims at Court, but was forced to return to Kilcolman, perhaps only for a flying visit, by his private affairs. He had a troublesome neighbour in Lord Roche, who was imprisoning his men and boycotting his tenants (*Cal. S. P. Ireland*, 1588-1592, 247), and it is hardly likely that he would abandon for two years the three thousand odd acres, the management and the peopling of which he had undertaken only a few months before he left for England (*ibid.*, 198). But he soon contrived another visit to his English friends. If we take the view that he dated his *Daphnida*, as Bacon dated his *Essays*, according to the modern reckoning, he was back again in England by January 1, 1591.

F. P. WILSON.

GEORGE WITHER

THE gentleman who advertised for his lost MS. was no doubt George Wither. He does not appear to have recovered it; at least I cannot trace it in his printed works. The letter written nine months later was addressed to Secretary Thurloe, and comes from the unpublished portion of his correspondence in the Bodleian Library (Rawlinson MS., A. 56, p. 333). It is not mentioned in any life of Wither which I have seen. *The Petition and Narrative of George Wither*, reprinted in the first collection of the Miscellaneous

* Grosart, with a vague reference to local records at Cork, states that in 1588 Spenser obtained by "purchase" from Bryskett the succession to the clerkship, and that in 1594 he surrendered the clerkship to Sir Richard Boyle (*Life*, pp. 151 and 205).

Works of Wither published by the Spenser Society in 1872, explains in detail the pecuniary claims referred to.

C. H. FIRTH.

An Advertisement. A Manuscript of Poems, Essays and Characters dedicated to Madam M. B. by G. W. lost upon Thursday the 12 of March. If anyone bring it to Mr. Seiles a bookseller, over against St. Dunstan's Church in Fleet street, he shall be thankfully rewarded.

Mercurius Politicus, p. 7668, numb. 353, Thurs. March 12-March 19, 1657.

RIGHT HONOURABLE,

It is now almost 5 moneths since I last made knowne my sad condition to his Highness and to your selfe ; and nigh 3 moneths since it pleased him by his reference to injoyne my attendance upon your Honour, who were to speak with him touching the contents of the petition herewith referred, which I have accordingly performed almost every day, both to the increase of my necessities, and to the imparinge of my health and credit without any comfortable effect ; yea and with the losse also (by that delay) of a favour which I was then in hope of toward my releef. The just importunities likewise of some of my creditors to whome I have forfeited my bands (and therewith my credit) by that meanes, and through the Commonwealth's breach of her ingagments to me, to make me weary of my life, and almost in doubt whether there be either justice or mercy left in the world, when I consider how long, and by whome I am exposed to so great extremities as I have declared.

I owe to the husband of the gentlewoman who favoures mee with the convayance of this letter unto your hands, 200*li.* by a band forfeited, whose confidence in me I have so much frustrated that I am ashamed to looke him in the face, and afflicted with no lesse greef then shame in regard of the streights whereinto I have thereby brought him, and I would rather (had it bene in my choice) have lost my life then that credit which I had with him and other honest men ; for I could lately have borrowed 2000*li.* upon my single band, and have to his knowledge borrowed 600*li.*, upon that security ; and honestly repay'd it. Sir, I beseech you to be so mercifull as to become a meanes that I may have upon accompt, at least so much as will discharge this and some other such like debts, out of that 1681*li.* 15*s.* 8*d.*, which is due to mee with Interest by an ordinance of Parliament to save my estate and credit untill the rest may be conveniently payd, seeing the whole had probably bene discharged about 2 years past, if that course of payment had not bene stopped by the present powre, for it is too unequall a partiallity to constrain one man to beare so heavey a burthen as I have sustained almost 15 years by the detaining both of that debt, and of 300*li.* per annum purchased of the state nigh 6 years without recompense as I have done.

Hee that sees all things takes notice of these greevances though fewe men are sensible of them ; and I am assured the wants and troubles which this Commonwealth grones under will never be abated untill it

be more just and mercifull to them who have adventured their lives, credits and estates for the saftie and wellfare thereof ; and I am no lesse assured that if such shall by her neglect of making her Ingagements to them be exposed to disgrace and ruine, shee will ere long have so few faithfull freindes and so many enemies, that her dishonourable distruction will soone follow, which I should be much more greeved for then for my owne undoeng. I would with more ease be silent till I starved then have beene thus importunate a year since, and would rather get my bread by day labour then spend so much of my pretious time as I have done for all the favours of any mortall man, if my relations and obligments to others did not inferre it ; but I now fear that those concernments will make me at last as impudent as some other are if my patience be strethd a little further. God will therfor I hope to prevent it, move your hart to take me and my deplorable condition into your serious and charitable consideracion ; for you have bene truly informed of my wants, and know that I have bene so faithfully serviceable to his Highness and this Republik, that I have not merited to be thus barbarously and disgracefully destroyed. In this hope I am a litle refreshed for the present, and for your charitable answers hereunto, you shall be constantly waited upon by,

Your Honour's

humble servant,

GEO. WITHER.

Decem. 28, 1657.

THE EARL OF ORRERY'S PLAY *THE GENERALL*

SINCE the appearance of my notes on the "heroic plays" of Roger Boyle, Earl of Orrery, in the April number of the *Review of English Studies*, my attention has been drawn by Mr. B. M. Wagner to a very important reference,* apparently overlooked by all interested students, to Orrery's *The Generall* in the Stowe MSS. collection at the British Museum. The reference is contained in a letter,† dated "Kensington, September 15, 1664," from Sir Heneage Finch, at that time the Solicitor-General, to his brother-in-law, Sir Edward Dering, who was an intimate friend of the Earl of Orrery and a commander of the Royalist forces in Ireland. The following excerpt contains the matter of literary interest : ‡

Yesterday was acted, in the greatest and noblest presence which the Court can make, before the fullest Theatre, and with the highest applause imaginable, my Lo. Orerys new play calld *The Generall*, formerly acted in Ireland by the name of *Altamira*, but much alterd and improved.

* Since this note was put into type Mr. B. M. Wagner has himself called attention, in the *Times Literary Supplement* of Sept. 2, to the same reference. He, however, incorrectly describes the MS. as Sloane 744 instead of Stowe 744. (Ed. R.E.S.)

† Stowe MS. 774, f. 81.

‡ Cat. Stowe MSS. in Brit. Mus., vol. i, p. 518.

This letter establishes two new facts of importance concerning *The Generall*. First, the opening performance at the Theatre Royal is shown to have occurred with great éclat on September 14, 1664—a date two weeks earlier than Pepys's first record of the play. Secondly, *The Generall* is revealed to be a revised piece which had previously appeared under the title *Altamira* at Ogilby's Theatre in Dublin. This is truly a startling bit of information concerning its stage history. At first sight it seems to destroy the chain of evidence by which I thought to identify *The Generall* as Orrery's first play, written early in 1661 at the particular request of Charles II. I believe, however, that chain of evidence will still hold in spite of this new light on its earlier history. Orrery had shown an interest in theatrical performances at Dublin when he had appeared as the chief sponsor for the production of Mrs. Katherine Philips's *Pompey* at Ogilby's new theatre in February 1662-63. It seems to me quite conceivable that he should give to Ogilby a copy of his own first play for acting purposes, even though he had a promise from the King that the play would be acted sometime at the Theatre Royal. The production of the original piece on the Dublin stage might well have shown him its faults and weaknesses. Then when he came to London in June 1664, he could have revised the text for Killigrew, so that the King's company were able in September to present *The Generall* as a production to rival the efforts of the Duke's players who had for the first time put Orrery's *Henry V.* on the stage in August 1664.

W. S. CLARK.

THREE FIFTEENTH-CENTURY SONGS

IN the interesting collection of Deeds and Documents relating to Tattershall Church and College, from the *Report on the Manuscripts of Lord De l'Isle and Dudley*, preserved at Penshurst Place, vol. i. (Hist. MSS. Com. 1925), among the Accounts for the year 1495-6, there is a bill for twopence due to R. Lounde, for the musical notation of *triplices cantus voc.* "Maydens of London"—that is, a Song for three voices, or a "Three Men's Song" (Freemen's Song). Three years later, the same Robert Lounde, described as Provost of the Choir, has a bill, dated 1498-9, "for notacion of a song called 'The Cry of Caley's,' 11d., and of one called 'Flos Florum,' 10d." These

three songs must have been popular in the last decade of the fifteenth century, and it is of interest to note that secular as well as religious songs were taught in the choir school of Tattershall College at that period. The accounts show that John Gigur was Warden 1458-1502, while Thomas Howard was Organist, and Robert Lynne was Master of the Choristers between the years 1490-1500. It will be remembered that the famous John Taverner was trained at Tattershall College, circa 1510-20 (see my *Early Tudor Composers*, Oxford University Press, 1925). Is anything known of these three songs?

W. H. GRATTAN FLOOD.

A NOTE ON SHAKESPEARE'S DRAMATIC PUNCTUATION

SOME valuable evidence may be found in the passage wherein Shakespeare uses punctuation for dramatic purposes in the tradition of the mispunctuated letter in Udall's *Roister Doister*. It is noteworthy that this usage occurs in the play that gives Shakespeare an opportunity of canvassing the general functions of what we now call the "producer." The play is the *Midsummer Night's Dream*, the "producer" is Quince, and the passage is in Act v. Sc. i. In the Fisher 4to of 1600 the text is:

Enter the Prologue.

Pro. If wee offend, it is with our good will.

That you should thinke, we come not to offend,

But with good will. To shew our simple skill,

That is the true beginning of our end.

Consider then, we come but in despight.

We doe not come, as minding to content you,

Our true intent is. All for your delight,

Wee are not here. That you should here repent you,

The Actors are at hand: and, by their showe,

You shall know all, that you are like to knowe.

The. This fellow doth not stand upon points.

Lys. He hath rid his Prologue, like a rough Colte: hee knowes not the stoppe.

A good morall my Lord. It is not enough to speake; but to speake true.

Hyp. Indeede he hath plaid on this Prologue, like a child on a Recorder, a sound; but not in governement.

The. His speach was like a tangled Chaine; nothing impaired, but all disordered. Who is next?

The comments of Theseus and Lysander seem to make it quite clear that the tampering with the "points" affects not only the sense but to some extent the elocution also. It will be noticed that the

effect of the careful punctuation of their comments is to give the utmost correctness and balance to Theseus and Lysander's sentences in dramatic contrast with Quince's methods. It seems, from the fact that Quince's speech is a prologue, that a distinction must be drawn between diction required for the main business of the play, about which we have little or no evidence, and deliberate elocutionary displays confined to prologues and epilogues. We have no evidence to show how far the soliloquy may be regarded as a display of elocution. An important epilogue whose elocutionary value is destroyed in modern punctuation may be found in Rosalind's conclusion to *As You Like It*. The folio punctuation is unmistakably directed to elocutionary ends.

Ros. It is not the fashion to see the Ladie the Epi/logue : but it is no more unhandsome, then to see the/ Lord the Prologue. If it be true, that good wine needs no bush, 'tis true, that a good play needes no Epilogue./ Yet to good wine they do use good bushes : and good/ playes prove the better by the helpe of good Epilogues :/ What a case am I in then, that am neither a good Epi/logue, nor cannot insinuate with you in the behalfe of a/ good play? I am not furnish'd like a Begger, therefore/ to begge will not become mee. My way is to coniure/ you, and Ile begin with the Women. I charge you (O/ women) for the love you beare to men, to like as much/ of this Play, as please you : And I charge you (O men)/ for the love you beare to women (as I perceive by your/ simpring, none of you hates them) that betweene you,/ and the wo/men, the play may please. If I were a Woman, I would kisse as many of you as had beards that/ pleas'd me, complexions that lik'd me, and breaths that/ I defi'de not : And I am sure, as many as have good/ beards, or good faces, or sweet breaths, will for my kind/ offer, when I make curt'sie, bid me farewell. *Exit.*

On the other hand, if there was an Elizabethan system of conscious theatrical punctuation, it seems strange that nothing survived in Restoration tradition. In spite of the fact that actors such as Lowin could have passed on the information, we have no knowledge of any acquaintance by Betterton with any such principles, and in 1665 we have clear evidence that no such tradition was known. The Royal Society appointed a committee to improve the English language. Of the committee were John Dryden, Bishop Sprat, Edmund Waller and John Evelyn. On June 20, 1665, Evelyn, who was unable to be present at the meeting, sent a list of suggestions for discussion.

No. 3 reads :

"That there might be invented some new Periods and Accents, besides such as our Gram'arians & Critics use, to assist, inspirit, and modifie the Pronunciation of Sentences, & to stand as marks beforehand how the voice & tone is to be govern'd ; as in reciting of Playes, reading of Verses, &c. for the varying the tone of the voyce, and affections, &c." ("John Dryden and a British Academy." By O. F. Emerson. *Proceedings of British Academy* 1921-23, p. 48.)

Would this careful suggestion have been made if anything of the sort were known to exist ?

J. ISAACS.

SHADWELL AND THE OPERATIC *TEMPEST*

In "Some Notes on Dryden," *R.E.S.*, vol. i. 1925 (No. 3, July), pp. 327-330, Mr. G. Thorn-Drury has sought to rebut the arguments adduced by Mr. W. J. Lawrence in favour of Shadwell's authorship of the operatic version of *The Tempest* (*Elizabethan Playhouse*, 1st Series, pp. 193-206). It is somewhat curious that Mr. Thorn-Drury seems to weaken his case in advance by admitting that Shadwell "may between the date of Davenant's death and the issue of the 1674 4to have had a hand in *The Tempest* as it proceeded on its successful career"; and that "there may have been as nowadays improved versions with dresses, etc., renewed, and possibly even half a dozen 'brews' of *The Tempest*."

A point that cannot be too strongly emphasised is the fact—apparently not brought out hitherto as an argument—that in the 1701 Folio of Dryden's Works, the editing of which, it is reasonable to assume, had been supervised by the author, the earlier (1670) text * appears, although the 1674 version was reissued in that same year and was the version then used on the stage. This fact nullifies Mr. Thorn-Drury's argument that Dryden had in mind the 1674 version when he printed the list of "my Plays . . . in the order I wrote them" (i.e. the list prefixed to *King Arthur*, 1692).†

It is hard to believe that the passage cited by Mr. Thorn-Drury from "The Epistle to the Reader" prefixed to *The Careless Lovers*,

* As Mr. Montague Summers points out, this 1701 text is "not in every detail an exact reprint of the 1670 quarto" (*Times Literary Supplement*, February 21, 1924, Correspondence).

† In this connection there is no reason to suppose that the 1695 edition, or rather collection, of Dryden's Works, which contains the operatic *Tempest*, dated on separate title page, 1690, was authorised by Dryden.

was intended to allude to the operatic *Tempest*, for Ravenscroft's play was published in 1673 (Term Catalogue, November 24, 1673), whereas the opera was not produced until c. April 30, 1674.

That Dryden was capable of providing his own vocal music and other operatic features, although he left incomplete the former element in *The State of Innocence*, may be inferred from his well-known operatic pieces, *Albion and Albanus* and *King Arthur*. The plain reason why he did not do so in the case of the revised *Tempest* was that at that period of his career he was working for the rival theatre (witness his Prologue and Epilogue "Spoken at the opening of the New House, March 26, 1674").

Even if it be admitted that the allusion in the Preface to *Albion and Albanus* to *The Tempest* indicates that he looked upon this work as his own, there is no reason to suppose that he meant more than to take to himself the credit of being jointly responsible with D'Avenant for the basic alterations of the play, namely, in structure and in the introduction of new characters. It may not be irrelevant to point out here that the 1670 *Tempest* has certain distinctive operatic features,* and had apparently been very successful.

The apparent ignorance of Tom Brown, Langbaine, and other contemporary writers on the question of the authorship is not difficult to understand when it is considered that Shadwell probably had no particular desire to advertise the fact that he had been responsible for making what is after all only an elaborated stage version of the Dryden-D'Avenant play. Other examples of such reticence may be noted in the case of the operatic version of *Macbeth*, 1674, 4to, attributed to D'Avenant on the authority of Downes; † and the operatic version of Fletcher's *The Prophetess*, 1690, ascribed to Betterton on the authority of Gildon. ‡

In Thomas Duffett's *New Poems, Songs, Prologues and Epilogues*, 1676, occurs an Epilogue to *The Armenian Queen*, which as far as I am aware has not hitherto been noted. The following passage may throw some light on the authorship of *The Tempest* :

* Eg. in Act II. "A Dialogue within sung in parts," introducing an allegorical masque with singing devils (C₁* * *); in Act III. a new lyric by Ariel followed by an Entry of "eight fat Spirits, with Cornu-Copia in their hands" who dance and vanish (F₁); in Act V. a Sarabande is danced (M₁*).

† *Roscius Anglicanus*, p. 33. Cf. also Hazelton Spencer's article "D'Avenant's *Macbeth* and Shakespeare's," in *Publ. Mod. Lang. Assoc. (Amer.)*, vol. xl. No. 3, September 1925, pp. 619-644.

‡ "I know not what reason Mr. Langbain has to attribute the revival to Mr. Dryden, when 'twas Mr. Betterton's" (Gildon's *Langbaine*, 1699, p. 60).

Alas, what hope does there remain for us,
 When y'have already shut up t'other house ;
 Yet we this Visitation time stay here,
 When raging censure reigns and wit grows dear
 In hope to gain your custom all the year.

When Tempests and Enchantments fly the Town,
 When *Prosp'ro's* Devils dare not stand your frown ;
 They to the Country strole with painted ware,
 Where mighty sums of precious time they share ;
 While Author Punch does strange Machines prepare
 For their new Opera in *Barthol'mew* Fair.
 He, prick'd in Conscience that he chous'd you so,
 With but the Copy of a Puppet-show ;
 To please you, thither does invite you all,
 For two pence to behold th'original.

It seems clear that " Author Punch " is intended to allude to the writer of the operatic *Tempest*. Now Shadwell is more likely than Dryden to have been reduced to preparing Drolls for Bartholomew Fair. Further, the nickname " Punch " might well have been applied to Shadwell, of whom it was written in the contemporary satire " A Session of the Poets " :

Next into the Crowd, To — S —, does wallow
 And swears by his Guts, his Paunch, and his Tallow,
 'Tis he that alone best pleases the Age,
 Himself, and his Wife have supported the Stage.*

A play upon the word " punch " is to be found in the contemporary Droll, *Cenone, A Pastoral*, printed in Kirkman's 1673 edition of *The Wits* : " Pity the panting paunch of pining *Punch*."

It is probable that a revival of *The Tempest* took place early in 1676, in which year a new edition appeared. It is noteworthy that Shadwell, whose *Virtuoso* appeared in May of the same year, chose for his next subject Shakespeare's *Timon* (acted c. February 1678, published in the same year). Although he did not turn this play into an opera, he introduced in Act II. a masque in which Nymphs and Shepherds sing in rivalry with the followers of Bacchus, the Mænades and the Ægipanes. It will be recalled that the masque of Neptune and Amphitrite in *The Tempest* constitutes in Mr. Lawrence's opinion the one great distinguishing feature of the operatic version. Lastly, in Act I. of Shadwell's *Timon* may be

* In *Poems on Several Occasions*, 1685, p. 101, usually ascribed to Rochester. The same poem with slight variations (e.g. the name *Tom Shadwell* is written in full, and " Punch " is written for " Paunch ") occurs in Buckingham's Works, 1704, p. 41, under the title *A Tryal of the Poets for the Bays*. The date of this poem is assigned by Sir Edmund Gosse (*XVIIth Century Studies*, p. 277) and by John Palmer (*Comedy of Manners*, p. 39) to the year 1675 ; but an allusion to Settle's *Ibrahim* points to the year 1677 or later.

found a slight but perhaps significant hint that the dramatist had been working on *The Tempest*. Shadwell puts into the mouth of the Poet nine couplets beginning

The fringed Vallance of your eyes advance,

a line obviously taken from the original *Tempest*, I. ii. 408.*

D. M. WALMSLEY.

JOHNSON'S LETTERS TO TAYLOR

IN my note in *R.E.S.*, ii. p. 89, I stated on Birkbeck Hill's authority that Johnson's last letter was numbered by Taylor 108. I have since seen the letter; Taylor's endorsement is "Last letter. 102." This reduces the number still unaccounted for.

I have also found in an old catalogue a record of a letter of 20 March 1773. This was no doubt Taylor's No. 25.

R. W. C.

CORRESPONDENCE

POPE AND MARY CHANDLER

MR. DOUGHTY, in his reply to my remarks on Pope and Mary Chandler in *The Review of English Studies* for July, relies on the "evidence" of Wakefield to support his original position. I confess that it had not occurred to me to regard the *Observations on Pope* in that light. Wakefield never pretended to possess any first-hand knowledge of Pope's methods of composition, and the Preface to the *Observations* makes it clear that they are a series of parallels "discovered" (to use Wakefield's own phrase) by the critic and his friends in the course of their reading. In other words, Wakefield was engaging in the fascinating but dangerous game of source-hunting. To treat as evidence his "unverifiable speculations," made half a century after Pope's death, seems unwise.

ARTHUR E. CASE.

REVIEWS

Seicentismo e Marinismo in Inghilterra. John Donne—Richard Crashaw. Mario Praz. Firenze. Società An. Editrice La Voce. 1925.

THE reading of this able and accurately documented study of two English poets, hardly known till our day to continental readers, gives one, as do several French studies, an uneasy feeling that this kind of critical research is better done by students trained in continental methods than by many of our own young researchers, a criticism which falls perhaps as heavily on us who are responsible for their training as on the young explorers. At least, to compare with this book Mr. Hugh I'Anson Fausset's *John Donne: A Study in Discord*, is to compare a spirited and not uninteresting attempt to trace the history of Donne's erotic and religious experience, based on a quite inadequate critical study of the sources, and insufficiently supported by a general knowledge of the period, with a careful and scientific attempt to analyse the significance of the two most remarkable representatives of one of the strangest and most interesting developments in English poetry and English religious thought and feeling. Signor Praz starts from a thorough study of the authors in question, and of all the work that has been done upon them in this country; but he has also a knowledge of Italian poetry, art, and religious sentiment in the century, by help of which he is able to shed many interesting sidelights on the works of these poets, so that while a considerable part of the work is, like Aronstein's similar work in German, an exposition of the life and work of these poets, based on the work of English students, for Italian readers, it contains much that is of interest and importance for English students themselves. Even the expository part is interesting to such a reader. The translations are accurate and excellent, and Mr. Praz is able to cite illuminating parallels from the Italian *Seicentisti* and earlier poets; but the most valuable part of the treatise on Donne is the discriminating and suggestive analysis of "metaphysical" poetry

(pp. 92 ff.); the comparison of the didactic and philosophical strain in Donne with that in the poetry of Dante and other poets of the "dolce stil nuovo" (pp. 99-101); and the general treatment of *Seicentismo* in the poetry of southern and northern peoples, the difference of reaction to the classical renaissance of the Italian and of the northern peoples (e.g. pp. 112-15).

Wisely, I think, Mr. Praz lays the chief stress, in analysing the "metaphysical" strain in Donne, not on the character of his "wit" but on the argumentative, ratiocinative evolution of the poem, and he has in a very interesting way contrasted the more normal evolution of a lyric by Campion—

When thou must home to shades of underground,

where the mood evoked by the rhythm and associations of the opening lines is sustained by the successive images and associations—the story of *Orpheus and Eurydice*—to the poignant close,

Then tell, O tell, how thou didst murder me !

with a poem by Donne with a similar rhythm and opening evocation of mood—

I long to talk with some old lover's ghost
Who died before the God of Love was born.

Such an opening, as Mr. Praz justly says, prepares you for some such strain as Villon's :

Dictes-moy ou, n'en quel pays,
Est Flora la belle Rommaine.

And then comes the shock, the surprise, "che fa stupire," when you are jerked off into a strain of argument developed in a style between which and that of prose there is no essential difference :

I cannot think that he who then lov'd most,
Sunk so low as to love one which did scorn,
But since this God produc'd a destiny,
And that vice-nature, custom, lets it be ;
I must love her that loves not me.

The development of the thought here, Mr. Praz says—and it is true at any rate of the first impression—suggests a kite which has risen with a noble sweep and then of a sudden checks, develops a side-ward movement, and descends in a series of swoops to the ground. "His lyrics fail to maintain the initial impetus, but losing the character of vigorous effusion which the opening has indicated degenerate into fatiguing and involved labyrinths of thought"

(p. 102). That is undoubtedly the first impression a lyric by Donne conveys, and if it is not always the final one, it is because one discovers that the shock is succeeded by another—the discovery that the impelling force behind this strain of subtle and tormented reasoning may be a passion much deeper and intenser than evokes Campion's more normal, more natural, more beautiful strain. But shock, surprise, contradiction between what the reader expects and gets, in development, in evolution, in language, in imagery, is of the essence of Donne's poetry, and the poetry of the *seicento*. Whether the final effect shall or shall not be one of more than surprise will depend upon the individual poet and poem.

Between the metaphysics of Dante and Donne, often identical in content, the difference which Mr. Praz justly indicates is that Dante and his fellows believed in and are concerned to expound their doctrines. Donne's use of these doctrines is purely artistic—admitting his conception of art—and sceptical: "Non di convincimenti metafisici si tratta, ma di divertimenti metafisici"; and he adds the same is true of his use of mediæval dogmas in the sermons: "Anche il Donne predicatore si servirà degli argomenti mediævali, ma il cardine della sua fede è diversa: la sua religione non è la religione d'un uomo del Medioevo, ma d'un uomo del Seicento: a base più psicologica che metafisica." Mr. Praz has much to say on Donne as preacher, and the dominant position of the preacher in the century, in his sketch of Donne's life.

Mr. Praz's discussion of Donne's imagery leads him into an interesting examination of the contrast between the spirit of the classical renaissance, seen at its purest in Italy, its aspiration after the ideal, the typical, and the gothic or mediæval realism which revived with modification in the baroque. This is extended into his study of Crashaw, and is too long for me, if I had all the requisite knowledge, to attempt to analyse or criticise. Donne, as he justly states, has no taste for the classical or that feeling for the beautiful in nature which classical poetry stimulated. "To Nature Donne opposes the world of his own brain ('il suo mondo cerebrale'); to the sensuous elements of music and colour, so much held in honour by the Elizabethans, his logical geometrics and abstruseness; to mythology and the graces of style images and tropes drawn from daily experience or scientific knowledge—the too close at hand and the too remote."

When the characteristics of Donne's style have been connected

as fully as can be with similar phenomena in the art and poetry of his time, he remains a singular, almost a unique figure, a passionate and tormented soul whose poems and sermons are the reflection of his own mentality. Crashaw's poetry gains more than Donne's from a study which connects it with the religious spirit of the Counter-Reformation and the sensuous, amorously religious art and poetry of a Bernini and a Marino. In dealing with Crashaw Mr. Praz has had the benefit of the investigations of Mr. L. C. Martin, the editor of Vaughan, now at work on an edition of Crashaw, to the canon of whose poetry he has made some notable additions. But here, even more than in the case of Donne, Mr. Praz enriches our comprehension and appreciation of Crashaw's poems by his parallels from contemporary devotional poetry in Catholic countries, Italian, Spanish and Latin; and the most interesting and reliable part of his work for an English reader is his description of the spirit and temper of the Counter-Reformation, the blend of amorous sensualism and spiritual fervour in the revived cult of the martyr and the saint, of which Jesuit poetry and art are the expression (pp. 145-151). "One of the most typical expressions of the phenomenon is the abundant cult of the Magdalene. For the plastic arts as well as in literature this motive renews itself inexhaustibly: in the beautiful sinner, pictured in the flower of her youth, who despoils herself of mundane pomps, and, ungirt and clothed in coarse garb, pours the silver stream of her tears on the feet of the Redeemer, wiping them with the golden river of her hair, the epoch must recognise itself as in a mirror. Contrition and indulgence were the hinges of Jesuit morality; remorse for the life of the flesh, the repentance of the eleventh hour, the gesture of the supreme refusal, the dramatic moment of conversion, the welcome given to the erring soul in the loving bosom of divinity—these were the most popular elements of that tormented and sophisticated faith and casuistry. To that erotic age the great amorous penitent—Venus in sackcloth—indicated the way of redemption, the possibility of eternal glory; and to many souls it must have seemed that he drew nearest to Christ, not only who had suffered much but, above all, who had sinned much." One is reminded of Goldwin Smith's description of seventeenth-century Catholicism, "debased and in low hands, the religion of kings to whom it promised absolute rule over an unreasoning people, and of voluptuaries to whom it held out salvation through magical rites and death-bed absolutions." But Mr. Praz is well

aware of the purity and sincerity of the religious ardour of the finest souls of the period, and justly refers his readers to the work of the great Dutch Catholic and poet, Vondel. Of this temper Crashaw's poems are the unique expression in English :

Soft exhalations
Of soul ; dear and divine annihilations ;
A thousand unknown rites
Of joys and rarefy'd delights.

Pure inebriating pleasures.

And the art of Crashaw's poetry is the art of the conceit, "L'argutezze," as cultivated in Jesuit Latin epigrams and in Italian and Spanish amorous and religious poets. To his illustration of the character and affinities of Crashaw's confectionery of conceits Mr. Praz has brought a wealth of learning (pp. 219 ff.) and a rare power of critical analysis. All this part of his work is a real contribution to our understanding of the poetry of Crashaw and his age. Crashaw's poetry is essentially epigrammatic : "*The Weeper* non è infatti che un rosario di epigrammi o di madrigali malamente legati insieme, *senza sviluppo*." There is no development in one of Crashaw's odes. It resembles a fountain throwing up drops that sparkle and take colour from the glow of a central fancy.

But Mr. Praz has not fallen into the mistake of considering that he has accounted for Crashaw, when he has traced the affinities of his poetry in spirit and art. He recognises clearly that there remains an individual and vital element which makes all the difference between Crashaw and some of his Italian compeers. There is a strain in his wit which connects with Donne ; but above all he has the ardour, imagination and music of a true poet. His closest affinities are with Swinburne. Mr. Praz has brought this out well in a comparison of Crashaw's translation of Marino's *Sospetto d'Herode* with the original. The whole work is an excellent piece of criticism, and, if the life and quotations could be condensed, the book well deserves translation for English readers.

H. J. C. GRIERSON.

The Halliford Peacock. Edited by H. F. B. BRETT-SMITH and C. E. JONES. Constable. Nine guineas. Vols. IX.-X.*

CONNOISSEURS of Peacock will not complain that they have had to wait for the second course—for the culinary operations are delicate,

* See *R.E.S.*, vol. I. p. 239, for review of vols. II.-V.

and this time the editors have had to hunt and kill the game before they could begin to dress it—nor even that, when it comes, it is a dish short of the programme. We were promised VIII. as well as IX.—X. It is held back for the satisfactory—indeed the appetising—reason that Peacock's letter to Hookham of April 9, 1811, and the fragment called *The Lord of the Hills*, are still at large. I hope a copy of the *R.E.S.* will reach their lurking-place and flush them.*

The two volumes before us consist entirely of articles not hitherto included in any collection of Peacock's works. In IX. we are given four articles from the *Westminster Review*, 1827–1830: reviews of Moore's *Epicurean* and *Letters and Journals of Lord Byron* (the first volume), and of Randolph's *Memoirs of Jefferson*, with an article on the projected new London Bridge. These are unsigned. There follow four articles from the *London Review*, 1835–6, signed M.S.O. (*i.e.* T.L.P., see below), on Lord Mount Edgumbe's *Musical Reminiscences*, French Comic Romances, The Epicier, and Bellini; and one from *Fraser's Magazine*, 1851, signed M.M. (*i.e.* Mary Meredith) on Gastronomy and Civilisation. Appendixes give extracts from Peacock's operatic notices and from a manuscript volume *The Science of Cookery*, written by Peacock with contributions by Meredith.

Volume X. consists mainly of articles from *Fraser's Magazine*. A series of *Horæ Dramaticæ*, expressly stated to be by one hand, is partly by M.S.O., partly by "The Author of Headlong Hall." (This settles the authorship of the *London Review* articles in Vol. IX.) There are other articles and reviews, mostly acknowledged, on classical and French literature. Peacock's translation of *Gl'Ingannati*, published separately in 1862 (and now very rare), concludes the volume.

It will be seen from this that the internal evidence is not complete. The editors might have saved one reader, at least, some trouble if they had made it clear that their appendixes are intended purely as bibliography, and not as a statement of the evidence of authorship. That, I understood, is settled by external evidence—a list of his occasional writings made by Peacock himself; so that there is no need to put two and two together. If we had to depend on internal evidence, it might be permissible to feel some misgiving about the articles on Jefferson. I had not supposed that so critical a mind as Peacock's could have entertained such a conception of

* The missing documents have since been found.

the American commonwealth—an image of incandescent purity, set off against the black background of a Europe, and an England, irreclaimably effete and rotten. The style, certainly, is eminently Peacockian. Here is a part of the account of Hamilton—a politician of the European type :

Another of Hamilton's fiscal manœuvres was the Assumption. The debts contracted, and the money expended, by the separate States during the war, was pretended to have been for general purposes ; the amount, not being ascertainable, was guessed to be twenty millions ; the fair distribution of these twenty millions among the several States was the subject of another guess ; and those who, in the midst of all this guessing, guessed that the partisans of the Treasury got the largest share of the spoil, were not the least correct guessers on the occasion.

Again :

Hell is paved with good intentions ; but heaven forbid that any portion of the pavement should be made of the liberties of America.

Aut Pavo aut Diabolus ? But I confess myself surprised, and a little disappointed, to find Peacock in 1830 believing European Governments to be " consecrated to the exclusive interests of the privileged non-producers " ; to find him endorsing without qualification Jefferson's judgment of England, " a nation of pikes and gudgeons." I should have preferred to hear Dr. Folliott or Dr. Opinion on these topics.

The rest, at least, is excellent Peacock, and the editors have done very well to restore it. On Tom Moore he is as trenchant and refreshing as we should expect ; and *London Bridge* is as good a piece of polemic as he ever wrote. A sustained attack on Rennie gains extra piquancy from the circumstances of our own time ; but it is a notable *trouvaille* without this adventitious interest.

Vol. X. is less exciting ; the articles on Greek dramatic fragments can hardly be appreciated without reference to the texts ; and the very long review of Müller and Donaldson's *History of Greek Literature* consists largely of quotation and summary. But everywhere there are *scintillæ* which we should be sorry to miss ; and the volume as a whole helps to put Peacock in perspective.

The high standard of editorial accuracy and tact, and of material execution, set by the former volumes, is maintained in these.

R. W. CHAPMAN.

The Plague Pamphlets of Thomas Dekker. Edited by
F. P. WILSON. Oxford: The Clarendon Press. 1925. 9s. net.

By providing them with this admirable reprint Mr. Wilson earns the gratitude of all Elizabethan students, while the Clarendon Press should claim its share for having brought such a scholarly volume within the reach of humble purses. It is difficult to think of any one reprint of recent years which has, within the limited scope of some two hundred odd pages of text, put at our disposal so much inaccessible work of any one of the more famous of the lesser Elizabethans. A vague impression that Dekker is not always easy to come by, even in the British Museum, was heightened into a positive reverence for the wealth of the Bodleian and into the afore-said gratitude for Mr. Wilson's labours, when the present reviewer realised the rarity of all six pamphlets included herein. Three are reprinted for the first time, and two are reprinted for the first time from the first editions. Four of the six belong to Bodley, one being unique: of the remaining two, both apparently unique, one belongs to the Guildhall: the other, which was at Britwell when Mr. Wilson's book was published, was sold in the Christie Miller sale of 15-18 March, 1926. This is indeed treasure-trove.

Bibliographically and textually this reprint is as complete and perfect as modern scholarship could make it. To the existence of more than one early edition of *The Wonderfull Year* Mr. Wilson is apparently the first to call attention; and his notes on these three editions, establishing their order of issue, may be recommended to every beginner as an object lesson in the application of the methods of bibliographical research.

Only *The Wonderfull Year* and *A Rod for Runawayes* are known to have been claimed by Dekker as his. *Newes from Gravesend* was first attributed to him by J. P. Collier. *The Meeting of Gallants*, *London Looke Backe* and *The Blacke Rod and the White Rod* are here attributed for the first time. In claiming these last three for his author, Mr. Wilson, as he himself is well aware, claims no first-rate work. This fact, however, in no way detracts from the critical acumen which led the editor to his discovery.

To support his attributions Mr. Wilson has not put forward any external evidence: he relies entirely upon the internal evidence

of style and of borrowings, both from and by Dekker's acknowledged work. Whilst believing that in this case the method justifies itself and that these pamphlets bear Dekker's sign-manual, it is perhaps advisable to enter one minor caveat. By the student this book will be used—and rightly—as a model of Elizabethan scholarship. To follow Mr. Wilson's reliance upon borrowings and style would, however, in the case of many Elizabethans be more than dangerous. There are few pamphleteers who have such distinctive characteristics as Dekker, and one could have wished that Mr. Wilson had enlarged upon the danger himself, as his reference to it on p. 255 may be missed. What he could not have enlarged upon it is the reviewer's privilege to add—the fact, namely, that this method can be used only by those whose wide reading amongst the minor Elizabethans rivals Mr. Wilson's.

M. ST. CLARE BYRNE.

Studies in Shakespeare, Milton and Donne. University of Michigan publications, Language and Literature, Vol. I. Macmillan Co. New York and London. 1925. Pp. 232. \$2.50.

THIS volume is the work of four writers, described on the title-page as "Members of the English Department of the University of Michigan," though the reader is not told what positions they hold in the department. Mr. O. J. Campbell contributes two Shakespearian studies which really fall under the common heading of the influence of the Italian *Commedia dell'Arte* upon Shakespeare; Mr. C. C. Fries writes upon *Shakespearian Punctuation*; Mr. J. H. Hanford deals in two articles with *The Youth of Milton* and "*Samson Agonistes*" and *Milton in old age*; while the sixth contribution, *The Religious Thought of Donne in relation to Medieval and later traditions*, is the work of Mr. L. I. Bredvold. Most of the essays are full of interest; and the twin studies of Milton in particular, which comprise 100 pp., *i.e.* nearly half the book, form a piece of criticism of fine discrimination and permanent value. That on the youth of Milton, which is the longer of the two, reminds one, indeed, both in scope and method, of Prof. Garrod's *Wordsworth*. Its theme is the spiritual and poetic development of Milton from

1625, when he went up to Cambridge at the age of sixteen, to 1638, the year which brought his secluded life at Horton to a close. And if Milton's residence at Horton be comparable, as it is in some respects, with Wordsworth's at Alfoxden, Mr. Hanford's study, though of slighter build than Prof. Garrod's, is not unworthy to be set beside it. He has no *Prelude* to draw upon like the English critic, but he makes full use of the *Apology for Smectymnuus* (1642), which he happily describes as "a kind of biographia literaria or *Growth of the Poet's mind*." This growth, of course, is considered chiefly in relation to the literary influences which determined its development, beginning with Sylvester's *Du Bartas* and proceeding through Ovid (for Milton in his Puritan way had his *Venus and Adonis* period) and through Dante and Petrarch to Spenser, his final master. But Spenser introduced him, or at least led him to appreciate, one who, though not strictly speaking a poet, exercised, we fancy, an even greater influence upon him than Mr. Hanford allows—we mean Plato. Mr. Hanford gives full recognition to the sway of Plato's ideas upon love over the young poet's mind, and shows how they encouraged Milton in his reaction from Ovid; but surely Plato meant more than this to him. After quoting Milton's description of the poet-teacher from the *Reason of Church Government*, 1641, Mr. Hanford remarks, "The poet no longer speaks privately to the aspirations of the individual, but to the public conscience of mankind. While he still cherishes for himself and for the few who can receive it the esoteric doctrine of chastity and true love, his immediate attention is bent, with all the tremendous energy of his spirit, upon the broader theme of 'virtue and public civility,' 'justice and God's true worship,' 'the rugged and difficult paths of honesty and true life.'" Is it not possible that this widening of Milton's outlook was due to a turn in his course of reading from the *Symposium* to *The Republic*? That he knew this latter book is clear from the undated *De Idea Platonica quemadmodum Aristoteles intellexit*, which ends thus significantly:

At tu, perenne ruris Academi decus,
(Haec monstra si tu primus inducti scholis)
Jam jam poetas, urbis exules tuae,
Revocabis, ipse fabulator maximus;
Aut institutor ipse migrabis foras.

These words do more than suggest that Milton had read *The Republic*; they hint that he had made up his mind to be one of the

poets whom Plato would recall to his ideal state. Indeed, Plato's description of the type of poetry he would encourage is just the kind of thing to have fired the mind of the young Milton. On the other hand, the whole tenor of Plato's argument would chime in with the growing republicanism both of Milton and of his age. In any event, the possibility of such an influence is assuredly worth exploration.

Mr. Hanford's article on *Samson Agonistes* is shorter, but scarcely less interesting, than its predecessor. The main point of it, which I think he drives firmly home, is that in this dramatic poem, to which Milton prefixes the famous comment upon Aristotle's formula concerning the catharsis, the old poet not only drew upon his own experiences, but actually found in the writing of it that purgation "which the untutored champion of Israel" discovered in his triumphant death.

After the Milton articles Mr. Bredvold's essay on Donne comes next in interest. The subject of the relation of Donne's religious thought to that of the middle ages is a vast one which no writer could hope to cope with successfully in an essay. Nevertheless, the treatment is often illuminating, and the essay is important (if for no other reason) as an excursion into the little worked and too long neglected field of the medieval sources of Elizabethan thought. What can be made of this theme as regards Shakespeare, Mr. E. E. Kellett's charming *Suggestions* has given us a glimpse, but the whole subject merits a systematic and comprehensive treatment, a beginning of which might well be made by reprinting Trevisa's translation of *Bartholomew Anglicus*, that great medieval encyclopædia which both Shakespeare and Donne undoubtedly knew in Berthelet's or de Worde's edition, and which is only accessible to the modern reader in Mr. Steele's handy, but of course incomplete, book of extracts entitled *Medieval Lore*.

Another link between Donne and Shakespeare is their common debt to Montaigne, or rather to the sceptical philosophy of Sextus Empiricus, of whom Montaigne was a disciple. Indeed, Mr. Bredvold raises in a footnote the interesting question whether Donne did not draw his inspiration direct from Sextus, whose *Hypotyposes*, as Dr. McKerrow has pointed out (Nashe's Works, vol. ii. p. 116; vol. iv. pp. 428 ff.) was known as early as 1591 in an English translation now lost. And if Donne had this direct access to the writings of the sceptic of Alexandria, may not Shakespeare have had it also?

Mr. Bredvold strangely leaves Shakespeare unmentioned in this connection, and it is difficult to imagine how he could have quoted from Donne's *Progress of the Soule* (1601) the words :

There's nothing simply good, nor ill alone,
Of every quality comparison,
The onely measure is, and judge, opinion,

without reference to "There is nothing either good or bad, but thinking makes it so," which occurs in a famous play belonging to the same year.

The essays upon Shakespeare himself are the weakest contributions to the volume. Mr. Campbell begins his *Love's Labour's Lost Restudied* with a merited tribute to M. Lefranc's discoveries, published in *Sous le masque de William Shakespeare*, and spends many pages in discussing how Shakespeare came to be making use in 1591, which is the date he gives to the play, of historical events which took place at the court of Henry of Navarre at Nérac in 1578. His conclusion is "that some travelled gentleman had established close enough relations with Shakespeare to induce the dramatist to use his personal reminiscences at the court of Nérac as a nucleus for his play." Seeing that the Nérac atmosphere is so attenuated that it could scarcely have been recognised by the spectators of Shakespeare's play, it seems pointless to suggest that the dramatist should have voluntarily borrowed it from any one. Surely the explanation is a simpler one, viz. that he used an old play based upon the visit of Marguerite de Valois to Nérac, and was not troubled entirely to obliterate the original plot, part of which served his purpose excellently.

The rest of the article, together with that on *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, is mainly concerned, as has been pointed out, with the thesis that Shakespeare worked under the influence of the *Commedia dell' Arte*, of which thesis I will only say that I for one shall be better prepared to believe it when Mr. Campell can find stronger arguments.

Finally, there is Mr. Fries on *Shakespearian Punctuation*. As this article attempts to disprove "the elocutionary theory of Elizabethan punctuation" I suspect that it was responsible for the book coming to my hands for review. Yet I find it hard to take seriously an argument which, based upon statements regarding punctuation made by contemporary grammarians, (i) omits all reference to Mulcaster's *Elementarie*, and (ii) quotes Ben Jonson's *English*

Grammar from Gifford's text, derived from the 1692 Folio, in which the section on punctuation had been doctored, in the direction of modernity, by a later seventeenth-century editor.* Moreover, though I am of course a prejudiced person, Mr. Fries's extracts appear to me to lend strong support to the "elocutionary theory." I therefore recommend all those who doubt the theory to study the article, to which I am the more grateful inasmuch as it refers to one or two grammarians not previously known to me.

J. DOVER WILSON.

A Chapter in the Early Life of Shakespeare. Polesworth in Arden. By ARTHUR GRAY, M.A., Master of Jesus College, Cambridge. Cambridge University Press. Pp. x.+123. Eight Illustrations. 7s. 6d.

MOST students of Shakespeare's biography have felt that the existing traditions of his early life at Stratford are unsatisfactory and probably unreliable; even the deer-stealing story has been impugned because it appears that Sir Thomas Lucy kept no deer at Charlecote. At the same time the "anti-Stratfordians" have created their own legends, the most popular being that, as the men of Stratford were bookless rustics, the son of John Shakespeare "must have been" an ignorant, country boor. Mr. Edgar I. Fripp, in his *Master Richard Quyny* has disposed of most of these legends. He has shown that Abraham Sturley and Richard Quyny, both close friends of the Shakespeare family, were well-educated men. Sturley was a Master of Arts of Oxford, and Quyny read Latin easily and for pleasure. Moreover, two of Sturley's sons and one of Quyny's went to Oxford, so that there was at least a mild interest in books even in Stratford. Still, it must be admitted that there does remain a large gap in Shakespeare's biography and that we do not yet know how or why Shakespeare came to be associated with the young Earl of Southampton or to write such "clever" pieces as *Venus and Adonis* and *Love's Labour's Lost*. There is, then, every reason to welcome any new theory that may throw light on Shakespeare's early years.

* v. Percy Simpson, *Bibliographical Study of Shakespeare*, Oxford Bib. Soc. I., i. pp. 36-7.

The Master of Jesus, in his book *A Chapter in the Early Life of Shakespeare*, puts forward the suggestion that Shakespeare for some years was a page in the house of Sir Henry Goodere, the patron of Michael Drayton. He is not, however, content with simply stating his theory, but must first attack the "Stratfordian tradition" on the old familiar lines. He begins unfortunately. In § 2, he draws a parallel from Dr. Hotson's *The Death of Christopher Marlowe* as "proving the worthlessness of gossiping tales, even when they are concerned with nearly contemporary matters." But Dr. Hotson's discovery did nothing of the sort; on the contrary, it showed that the contemporary gossip of Beard, Meres and Vaughan was largely founded on fact. Beard knew that Marlowe was stabbed in the eye with the dagger which he tried to thrust into his opponent. Vaughan knew that Marlowe had written a book against the Trinity (and he is not likely to have had access to Puckering's papers); that he was stabbed in the eye; that the affair occurred at Deptford. In fact, these versions are so substantially accurate that they throw doubt on the strict truth of the tale which Frezer, Skeres and Poly told the coroner, for they had far more cause than Beard and the rest to distort the facts, and if there was—as Meres suggests—a "lewd love" in the case, the less said about her before the jury the better. Even Aubrey's wild statement that Ben Jonson killed Marlowe on Bunhill coming from the Green Curtain playhouse has a substratum of truth in it; *Every Man in His Humour* was being performed at the Curtain when Jonson fought a duel, though the name of his victim was Spenser—the actor not the poet.

Mr. Gray proceeds to erect his own image of the "gentle Shakespeare," and dislikes the legends because they will not gracefully drape around it. "Does Shakespeare rail?" he asks in § 5, and he answers, "If in Shallow he permits himself to gibbet Lucy, it is the only example of personal satire—I might add of personal reminiscence—that can be reasonably detected in his plays." He refuses to believe that there is any satire in *Love's Labour's Lost*. It is difficult to agree; but certainly the purge which made Jonson "bewray his credit" can have been no gentle aperient. Mr. Gray, however, is not above arguing both ways. Though Shakespeare never indulged in reminiscence, he is surprised that Falstaff was not brought through Stratford for the sake of the local colour which might have been introduced. Incidentally, Mr Fripp has shown that the plays abound in reminiscences of Stratford. But the main

objection to the Stratford tradition is that "at Stratford nobody had any use for books, and nobody traded in them."

By the time that the constructive arguments for placing Shakespeare at Polesworth are reached they have rather lost their force, especially as Mr. Gray relies more on rhetoric than on argument and can produce no new facts for his theory. The only connection between the Shakespeare family and Sir Henry Goodere is that in January, 1571 (Shakespeare then being aged 6½), Sir Fulke Greville, Sir Thomas Lucy, Clement Throckmorton and Henry Goodere, of Polesworth, acted as arbitrators for the Corporation of Stratford and were entertained by the Corporation, and that during the next two years John Shakespeare on two or three occasions met Goodere on the affairs of the town. Of course, Mr. Gray has some "internal evidence" from the plays to support his theory, but internal evidence is two-edged. The "Stratford legend" itself is crisply epitomised by the old Shepherd in *The Winter's Tale*—"I would there were no age between sixteen and three-and-twenty, or that youth would sleep out the rest; for there is nothing in the between but getting wenches with child, wronging the ancients, stealing, fighting."

If the young Shakespeare was taken into the family of any of the great gentlemen who lived near Stratford, Sir Fulke Greville has as good a claim as any; it would be a good deed for some one to bring Shakespeare to his house as the companion to his son, Fulke Greville the younger, and so introduce him to Sir Philip Sidney, Spenser and the rest. Meanwhile, we must be content with Rowe.

G. B. HARRISON.

A Cabinet of Characters. Chosen and edited by GWENDOLEN MURPHY. Oxford University Press. Pp. xxxvi. + 437. (Frontispiece and 10 Illustrations.) 12s. 6d. net.

THE Renaissance made various experimental efforts to turn its learning to profitable uses by striking the popular note. Polydore Virgil, for example, published his *Proverbiorum Libellus* in 1498. Ten years later Erasmus followed with his *Adagia*, and set in movement the succession of Proverbs, Flowers of Speaking and Epigrams that one associates with the names of Heywood, Udall and others in the sixteenth century. This particular movement

came to nothing, unless we attribute to it in some degree the epigrammatic character of the essays of Bacon. It contributed nothing to the novel or drama that was not superficial. The failure that is written in their prologues and epilogues suggest that the satirists were even less happy in their experiments than the writers of Proverbs and Adages. When we consider the vogue of the Characters of the seventeenth century, however, the case is different. They were experimental like the others, but they still have interest. They throw light on the men and manners of their time; they are always appropriate. Theophrastus, Chaucer, Fuller, Steele, Lamb, Thackeray, as Miss Murphy shows us, all handle the character as though it were part of the material of literature, one of the elements that cannot be superannuated. That its development in the seventeenth century had in it a high degree of artificiality is obvious; yet it contributed to the development of novel, drama and essay, and must be taken into account in any investigation of these forms of literary entertainment.

Until the Bibliographical Society published last year Miss Gwendolen Murphy's *Bibliography of English Character Books, 1608-1700*, the full extent of this literary fashion was very imperfectly realised; but bibliographies are only indexes to literature, and Miss Murphy has now offered us the fruits of her researches in the more enjoyable form of an anthology of Characters. She has not confined her selections to the seventeenth century; though it claims its place of precedence, with approximately two-thirds of the space in the Cabinet assigned to it. Rather it is as a permanent and persistent type in literature, not a mere temporary fashion, that Miss Murphy has set her characters before us, and the present writer is not sure that he would not award the first place in the show to Galsworthy and Lamb.

In her introductory essay Miss Murphy clears up the confused association of the character with satire, epigram, and essay, and its relations with the sermon and drama. This she does, in more than one instance, by a happy use of the views expressed by the character writers themselves on the scope and distinctive features of their work. The interest of knowing what the seventeenth century meant by its terms may be illustrated by a remark of Richard Flecknoe: "Epigrams . . . I aptly couple with the Characters, since these are only Epigrams in Prose, as the others are only Characters in Verse." From the essay

he distinguishes it as "not discoursing, but giving only the heads of things in general." As a result of her examination and analysis Miss Murphy has been able with definiteness to isolate the "form" of the Character, and thereby to determine what might and what might not be lawfully admitted into her anthology. And it is a remarkable fact that whether in verse or prose, whether in writers as far apart in time as Chaucer and Thackeray, this form is observed. It has the further advantage of enabling her to sketch with point and lucidity the history of the Character both before and after its seventeenth-century vogue. And here we would remark that this pleasant book has a very solid foundation in English scholarship. Evidences of this appear on most of its pages; and few of us will fail to admire a writer who without any enlargement makes the plain statement that "Out of 1100 plays published before 1700, only about forty comedies have a fairly definite relation with the character." Not less important than the Introduction are the bibliographical and explanatory notes to each writer, notes admirably condensed and always significant. The temptation to say more must often have been sore, especially of so interesting a problem as the Overbury Collection. Yet Miss Murphy has managed to sum up the Webster problem and say something of the reference to Burbage. Without any doubt this is a book which could have been produced by no one who has not given to the subject the close study that Miss Murphy has devoted to it. It is moreover a simple and attractive book; but those who know and use the Bibliography to which we referred earlier will realise best how much each book owes to the other. As an illustration of new material that Miss Murphy has brought to light we would refer to the very pleasing character of the Frenchman by Dr. Andrewes that she has given us from MS. Harl. 4955; and hardly less original, to the ten illustrations from contemporary sources that accompany her text.

A. W. REED.

The Life and Poems of Nicholas Grimald. By L. R. MERRILL. *Yale Studies in English*, LXIX. Yale University Press; Oxford University Press. 1925. iv.+463. 20s. net.

DR. MERRILL'S dissertation on Nicholas Grimald is a substantial piece of work that has many merits not likely to be long overlooked

by students of Early Tudor Literature. The clues that Grimald has left us in his poem on *The Death of Annes his Mother* and in the dedication of his *Christus Redivivus* to Gilbert Smith, Prebendary of Leighton Bromswold in Northamptonshire, have led Dr. Merrill into a fruitful field of inquiry and enabled him to build up a coherent and interesting outline of Grimald's life. Of superior yeoman stock, his mother being apparently a woman of educated mind, he owed much to the patronage and interest of Smith, who urged and helped him when he had graduated at Cambridge to proceed to Oxford. There he not only wrote his two Latin plays, but, if we may judge from the long list of works attributed to him by his friend Bale, occupied himself assiduously in his office of lecturer in Rhetoric as a translator, annotator, and in the study and practice of poetry. Dr. Merrill's valuable examination of Bale's lists is convincing evidence, if evidence were needed, of Grimald's energy and enthusiasm in humanistic pursuits. He appears from a letter to Cecil (1549) to have attracted notice outside his Universities, and he left Oxford to join the rank of the "preachers" of Edward's reign and to become chaplain to Bishop Ridley, who was evidently attached to him by the ties of common interests, and certainly sympathised with his enthusiasm for letters.

In Mary's reign, to use the words of Thomas Warton, Grimald "appears to have been imprisoned for heresy and to have saved his life if not his credit by a recantation. But theology"—he adds—"does not seem to have been his talent nor the glory of martyrdom his ambition." One regrets that Dr. Merrill makes so much of the painful suggestion of Foxe that Grimald betrayed Ridley. A sympathetic reading of the evidence makes other conclusions possible; and to view with pity the tragic conflict of humanism and religious principle in this pitiless age is often more fruitful than to take sides in condemning. In the year following Ridley's death Tottell published Grimald's rendering of Cicero's *De Officiis*, and the next year, in the famous Miscellany, forty of his poems. That these were reduced to nine in the second edition eight weeks later, and that Grimald's name was reduced to initials, Dr. Merrill accounts for by the assumption that his recantation had made a bad impression on Tottell's customers and patrons. On the other hand, one might assume that, by the same token, Grimald must have had a good deal to do with the first edition; but the problem awaits

solution. He survived the Miscellany less than five years and died in the prime of life. His *Christus Redivivus* had been printed in 1543 and his *Archipropheta* in 1548 at Cologne. Dr. Merrill sets out very fully the fortunes of the former play on the Continent and how much of it is represented still in the Oberammergau Passion Play. He assists his readers greatly by offering them a text and translation of both plays, and contributes full and well-informed introductions. His bibliographical notes and illustrations are admirable and indicate an unusually keen questing spirit. His texts have been subjected to a damaging criticism by one who is himself almost invulnerable in the point of textual accuracy; but the solid and in some respects remarkable merits of his work must not be overlooked. It bristles with indications of his pertinacity in inquiry and it shows that he has caught from Professor Berdan of Yale a real enthusiasm for Early Tudor studies. Besides the Life, the text and translation of the Latin plays and his valuable introductions to them, Dr. Merrill gives the text—with notes—of the English poems of Grimald. In these he has made use of Dr. Hudson's article on Grimald's translations from Beza, but was probably unaware that Dr. Hudson had been anticipated, as I learn from Mr. H. J. Byrom of King's College, by the younger Nott. As a pioneer in modern English verse forms, an early and perhaps the first English practitioner in blank verse, and as a typical humanist of his age, Grimald is an interesting and significant figure, while as an academic dramatist of originality and power, his work had an important influence on the Continent. Dr. Merrill is justified in regarding him as an influential innovator in English poetry and in claiming that his importance has been underestimated. It may be a matter of personal sentiment, but one regrets that he has not been able to extend to him more personal sympathy. I do not feel that he has brought us as near to Grimald as has the poet himself in his verses on the death of his mother. There, at least, is no hint of what Dr. Merrill calls "the duplicity of Grimald's character," nor is he here "currying favour with the great."

A. W. REED.

The Translator of Dante: The Life, Work, and Friendships of Henry Francis Cary (1772-1844). By R. W. KING. London: Martin Secker. 21s. net.

AMONG the minor figures in our literary history few are of greater importance than Henry Francis Cary. He was the finest Italian scholar of his age, and though in the previous half-century some interest had been taken in Italian literature, no one else save Gray seems to have realised Dante's greatness; and to Cary alone belongs the honour of having introduced Dante to the general English reader. His translation of *The Divine Comedy*, for some years neglected, leapt into fame after it had gained the enthusiastic praise of Coleridge; it was the pocket companion of Keats upon his Scotch tour; it won later encomiums from Macaulay, and Ruskin, and others of less note; and though since its publication countless translations have appeared and are still appearing, Cary's version has never been superseded.

For these reasons alone Mr. King's careful and informing biography would be welcome; for the *Life and Letters* compiled by Cary's son Henry in 1847, and up till now our only authority, has long been out of print, and with the merits has also the defects naturally incident to such works of piety. But Cary had other claims to our interest. He was a fine classical scholar, and did good work as a critic and translator of Greek poetry; he was a student, translator, and critic of early French poetry at a time when even in France French literature before Malherbe was almost entirely ignored; he was a sound and suggestive, if not an inspired essayist upon our own poetry, and some of his judgments, *e.g.* those upon Chatterton and on Coleridge, are well worth recalling. And though Cary's life was as a whole the quiet uneventful life of a modest scholar, it throws interesting sidelights on the literary movements of the period, and brings us into contact with not a few notable personalities, whose regard for him and evident enjoyment of his friendship is itself a tribute to his gifts and character. As a boy he worshipped at the shrine of the famous "Swan of Lichfield," Miss Anne Seward; at Oxford he was one of the two privileged undergraduates to whom Landor deigned to show his compositions; later he became an active contributor to Taylor's famous *London Magazine*, and was intimate with several of its most distinguished writers, with

Lamb in particular and with the poets Clare and G. Darley. . . . Most important, however, for his fame was that meeting with Coleridge in 1817, which rapidly developed into a solid friendship. It took place on the sands of Littlehampton, where Cary was engaged in recruiting his health and teaching Greek to his little son Henry, who afterwards recorded the meeting in the most vivid pages of his Biography. Mr. King quite rightly quotes from these pages, but he omits a passage which I will supply :

I was too young at that time, says Henry Cary, to carry away any but a very vague impression of his [Coleridge's] wondrous speech. All that I can remember is that I felt as one from whose eyes the scales were just removed, who could discern and enjoy the light, but had not the strength of vision to bear its fullness. Till that day I had regarded Homer as merely a book in which boys were to learn Greek ; the description of a single combat had occasionally power to interest me ; but from that time I was looking for pictures in the poem, endeavouring to realise them in my mind's eye, and especially to trace out virtues and vices as personified in the heroes and deities of the Homeric drama.

This passage is, doubtless, chiefly interesting as a tribute to Coleridge's "wondrous speech," but it is surely not without its significance when we attempt a final estimate of Cary's own achievement. For obviously, a few words from Coleridge had an influence upon the boy which all the patient teaching of his father, a better scholar than Coleridge, had never exercised. Coleridge, with all his shortcomings, was a genius in criticism. Cary in all his work, whether as critic, poet, or translator, seems to have every quality except just that indescribable something which raises a work into the highest regions of literature ; and this same lack is what, in truth, withholds Cary's *Dante*, whatever its excellences, and they are many, from taking rank as a great English poem. Mr. King has carefully analysed Cary's use of language and metre, and thrown fresh light upon their sources. If in his estimate of their intrinsic quality he seems to err on the side of eulogy, it is a fault pardonable enough in a biographer. For the fact remains that Cary's *Dante*, pre-eminent as it is among English versions of *The Divine Comedy*, cannot be placed as a work of art by the side of, e.g. the *Homer* of Chapman or Pope, or Rossetti's *Vita Nuova* ; and the reason of this is suggested in the passage that I have quoted above, in which Henry Cary innocently implies a comparison between his father and Coleridge. It is easy to understand that the passage was not

germane to Mr. King's immediate purpose, but it explains to us how it is that Cary takes a lower place among our writers than the importance of his achievement sometimes seems to warrant.

Mr. King has done an admirable and scholarly piece of work, which will prove of value to all students of the period of literature which it covers. We have noted in it only one slight error of fact. On p. 53 we are told that Cary met Southey "probably in Landor's rooms. But at this time Landor himself was but slightly acquainted with the future Poet Laureate." Southey has himself distinctly stated that Landor's reputation for "Madness" prevented his seeking his acquaintance while at Oxford.

E. DE S.

Mittelenglische Originalurkunden (1405-1430), mit Einleitung und Anmerkungen herausgegeben von HERMANN M. FLASDIECK. (Alt- u. Mittelengl. Texte, XI.) Heidelberg : Winter. 1926. Pp. 110.

OUR knowledge of the development of Standard English is still a vague one ; but that the nucleus was fourteenth-century London English, or at any rate one type of London English of that date, was shown by Morsbach a generation ago.

The old view that Chaucer and Wycliffe were the makers of our language has been proved untenable ; and a later theory, supported with great skill and learning by Dibelius, which would assign to an Oxford type some considerable part in the formation of the language employed by Caxton, has been shown to be at least unproven.

On general grounds it might well be thought that Oxford and Cambridge, and the merchant-community of Norwich, are likely to have exercised no inconsiderable influence on the slowly-developing embryo ; but definite evidence of such influence for the early stages is yet lacking. That during the two centuries of its growth Standard English absorbed many elements extraneous to the original nucleus, is obvious ; but there seems to be now general agreement that the first cells of the organism developed in London and in London only.

The problems now most urgently awaiting solution are, as Prof. Flasdieck points out, the manner in which the London type

spread as a standard throughout the country, and the interaction of the various dialects and the original type.

The former problem has already been indicated by Prof. Flasdieck in his *Forschungen zur Frühzeit der Neuenglischen Schriftsprache* (Morsbachs Studien, LXV., 1922), in which learned treatise he examined the whole field of investigation into the early development of the "Schriftsprache," and indicated the right lines of research. The publication of his promised further discussion of the principles of philological investigation of original deeds, will be awaited with great interest. Meanwhile he offers us, in the book under review, a valuable contribution to the study of one definite part of the problem.

The philological examination of original deeds extraneous to London and Middlesex may be said to have begun three years ago with Morsbach's *Mittelenglische Originalurkunden von der Chaucer-Zeit bis zur Mitte des XV. Jahrhunderts*, in which are printed some two dozen private deeds from over a dozen counties.

The book before us contains fifteen somewhat more lengthy documents (agreements, wills, attestations, settlements, feoffments, letters, etc.), connected with eight different counties, of which five are not represented in Morsbach's collection. It is the forerunner of a more extensive work which the learned editor has nearly completed: a collection of some hundred deeds bearing dates between 1430 and 1460.

It should be noted that Prof. Flasdieck rejects any document which is a mere copy, and concerns himself only with original deeds, etc., bearing the date of their execution. There seems to be no doubt that of the fifteen documents he offers us, the majority can be definitely localised. Whether, however, No. VI. is to be assigned to Berkshire or to the Essex-Suffolk border, is not clear; and the precise local origin of No. XIV., which, while referring to Norfolk and Suffolk estates, was executed in Normandy, must remain uncertain.

Needless to say, an exact reproduction of the MSS. has been aimed at. When compelled by printers' limitations to depart from this ideal, as, for instance, in reproducing certain contractions and flourishes, the editor adds notes, giving accurate and precise details of the palæography. There are two general exceptions to the "diplomatic" procedure: the unsystematic punctuation of the originals has been disregarded, and in the case of capital letters

some compromise has been made in the direction of modern usage. The majority of readers will welcome these slight changes, though a few perhaps will regret their necessity.

The Introduction includes, in condensed form, some of the valuable results which Prof. Flasdieck has already made known in his *Forschungen*.

A complete apparatus is furnished for the right understanding of the text : summaries of each document, descriptions of the persons and places recorded, full lists of personal and place-names, and copious notes dealing with every point of philological, palæographical, and historical interest.

Prof. Flasdieck has also taken the trouble to help the general reader by including explanations of obsolete terms and archaic legal usages. His little book will attract the attention not only of philologists but of students of history and sociology.

The importance of work such as this in furthering a particular line of philological investigation, needs no comment. Incidentally one notices in the volume under discussion more than one sign that the study of Historical Syntax also may yet profit by these and similar researches.

J. H. G. GRATTAN.

A Dictionary of Modern English Usage. By H. W. FOWLER.
Oxford : at the Clarendon Press. 1926. 7s. 6d. net.

It is difficult to describe this book. The effect of having had it lying on one's desk for a week or two, and of dipping into it intermittently, has been to inhibit the confidence that has hitherto greased the wheels of the reviewer's pen ; and his previous light-hearted impulses, in selecting his vocabulary, wilt under the searchlight that Mr. Fowler's articles turn on his Usage, *e.g.* :

cachinnate, -ation, -atory. See POLYSYLLABIC HUMOUR.
cacoethes scribendi. See BATTERED ORNAMENTS.
cacophonous, cacophony. See ANTI-SAXONISM.

May he call the book a farrago ? Or is that word blacklisted under PEDANTRY, HACKNEYED PHRASES, or ELEGANT VARIATION ? No, apparently not ; nor under LITERARY WORDS, nor (he sighs with relief) under LITERARY CRITICS' WORDS. Is it then permissible on other grounds ?—for the Dictionary stimulates its owner to extreme

self-consciousness. Perhaps the classical word carries some connotation of odds and ends (which it would be ANTI-SAXONISM to call heterogeneity), whereas the Dictionary is a cosmos ("ordered and harmonious," O.E.D.). Safer, perhaps, to revive a phrase once familiar on the posters of Lord George Sanger's and other circuses: "Monstre Olio of Attractions." Stevenson recorded the fascinating, mystifying ("intriguing" is barred) expression in *The Wrecker*, though he missed the oddity of the spelling "Monstre," which no doubt Mr. Fowler could explain in a Pseudo-Gallicism article in the next edition. The olio is certainly monstre: 750 pages of close but clear print in double columns; it is crammed with attractions; and being marketed, thanks to the generosity of the Clarendon Press, as Mr. Fowler acknowledges, at a shilling per hundred pages, is as cheap a ticket to bliss as the circus tariff used to be. Also, as in the circus programme, one thing leads to another; the attractions are not only obvious on a casual opening of the volume (sors Virgiliana: see TECHNICAL TERMS?), but seductive, since cross-references tempt the reader from one article to half-a-dozen others.

Consequently it is more than difficult to review the Dictionary: it is impossible. If, in fifty years' time, some student equally painstaking, sensible, and witty will then make a comparative study and analyse the effect which Mr. Fowler's recommendations may have had upon the usage of English between 1926 and 1976, his report will carry weight. Pending such finality (see POMPOSITIES, WARDOUR STREET, etc.), it may be said that a fortnight's use of the Dictionary shows that Mr. Fowler generally holds the balance fairly between reaction and revolution. Some samples will be the best evidence of this:

Spelling reform. . . . The line here followed is, then: that the substitution for our present chaos of a phonetically consistent method that should not sacrifice the many merits of the old spelling would be of incalculable value; that a phonetically consistent method is in English peculiarly hard to reconcile with the keeping together of word families, owing to the havoc played on syllable sounds by variations of stress (in *fraternity fraternise* three-vowel sounds are metamorphosed by the shifting of stress); that most reformers are so much more awake to the obvious advantages of change than to its less obvious evils that we cannot trust them with the disposal of so vastly important a matter; and finally that English had better be treated in the English way, and its spelling not be revolutionised but amended in detail, here a little and there a little as absurdities become intolerable, till a result is attained that shall neither overburden schoolboys nor stultify intelligence nor outrage the scholar. . . .

bureaucrat, etc.—The formation is so barbarous that all attempt at self-respect in pronunciation may perhaps as well be abandoned . . . it is better to give the whole thing up, and pretend that *-eau-* is the formative *-o-* that ordinarily precedes *-crat*, etc.; all is then plain sailing; it is only to be desired that the spelling could also be changed to *burocrat*, etc.

super-—The use of this as an abbreviation for "of a superior kind," as in *superman*, *super-Dreadnought*, *super-critic*, and scores or hundreds of other words, is so evidently convenient that it is vain to protest when others indulge in it, and so evidently barbarous that it is worth while to circumvent it oneself when one can do so without becoming unintelligible. . . .

Throughout, Mr. Fowler's attitude is that of the keen observer of tangles and obscurities, of the deliberate resolver of involutions, of the advocate of clarity by way of simplicity. His article on the **Split infinitive**, which previously appeared in a pamphlet of the S.P.E., does not satisfy our curiosity to know who invented the term, and perhaps does not insist strenuously enough on (a) the fact that the Conscientiously Avoided s.i. is nearly always more objectionable than the s.i. honestly embraced, and (b) the fact that nearly always the better remedy is not to put the splitting adverb first, but last, after the object: *e.g.* "correctly to write English" is a Conscientiously Avoided s.i. of a formation daily familiar, and impudently pen-proud compared to "to write English correctly." He concludes the article with a neat open question.

Few dictionaries can exist in which amusement is so frequently combined with instruction. Under *a posteriori* in **TECHNICAL TERMS** he writes:

God's in his heaven—all's right with the world is an *a posteriori* inference if it means The world is so clearly good that there must be a god in heaven; but an *a priori* inference if it means that since we know there is a god, the state of the world must be right.

We observe no comment on the growing looseness of the use of "practically" = almost, nor on "later on" for "later"—a red rag to some bulls; and if we had not been intimidated by a study of articles like **DIDACTICISM**, **FETISHES**, **GENTEELISM**, and so forth, we should have deprecated the instruction:

postscript. Pronounce pō'skrīpt.

F. SIDGWICK.

Jahrbuch der Deutschen Shakespeare - Gesellschaft.

Herausgegeben von WOLFGANG KELLER. Neue Folge I. Band (der ganzen Reihe Band 59/60). Jena. 1924. Verlag der Frommannschen Buchhandlung. Walter Biedermann.

Shakespeare Jahrbuch. Herausgegeben von WOLFGANG

KELLER. Band 61 (Neue Folge II. Band). Leipzig. 1925. Verlag Bernhard Tauchnitz.

THOSE who until 1914 were accustomed to rely on the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch* for a yearly summary of work done in all countries on Shakespeare and the literature of his period, and to make constant use of the series of volumes for the tracking down of floating theories to their sources, found themselves greatly at a loss when during the war-years it was unobtainable. Gradually, however, as time passed it has perhaps been in some measure forgotten. Few subscriptions from this country seem to have been renewed, perhaps as much owing to the uncertainty whether the *Jahrbuch* was still published and as to the amount payable for it in a wildly fluctuating currency as to anything else, and it may be a surprise to some that all this while it has continued to appear and to review all the more noteworthy English and American books on its subject.

The *Jahrbuch* has indeed passed through troublous times. Already in 1915 it began to show signs of shrinkage, and each of the volumes to 1918 is thinner than its predecessor. In 1919 there was a change of editor, Dr. Wolfgang Keller replacing Profs. Brandl and Max Förster, and a new publisher, but all the features of the old *Jahrbuch*, except the annual list of the members of the Shakespeare-Gesellschaft, which had been dropped in 1915, were maintained, including the familiar red-brown binding in cloth. In the three following years, however, 1920-22, the *Jahrbuch* appeared in a still more reduced form and with a paper cover.

A new series was begun in 1924 with a new publisher. The volume covers the years 1923-24 and is numbered 59/60 of the old series and Vol. I. of the new one. Unfortunately the binding was changed, a peculiarly hideous scheme of red lettering on blue cloth being chosen. Lastly comes the volume for 1925 (Band 61: neue Folge II. Band), in which a binding approximating to that previous to 1919 has been used. It might perhaps be suggested that similar binding cases might be made obtainable for the

volumes for 1920-24, the three paper-covered ones being bound together, so that the series might be restored to some sort of uniformity.

The two volumes before us contain a number of articles of interest,* but, apart from the very useful reviews, nothing, I think, of first-rate importance to English students. The earlier volume includes a discussion by G. Hartmann of the use of gesture on the Elizabethan stage as indicated by the original stage directions in the Shakespearean plays, but the material is really insufficient to add much to what might be inferred from our knowledge of the general conditions of the stage of the time. Primitive methods and especially out-of-doors performances obviously necessitate a more emphatic type of action than is needed when the actor can rely on the minor voice-modulations to convey the effect. A discussion of Shakespeare's part in the *Two Noble Kinsmen*, by Karl Ege, summarises and re-discusses previous views; the date of *All's Well that Ends Well* is re-considered by Elizabeth Schaefer, and there is an account by Emil Wolff of "Die sogennante Shakespeare-Bacon-Frage," which summarises pleasantly the history of this curious perversity. Among those of the second volume may be mentioned the discussion of the special adaptation of *Midsummer Night's Dream* for court performance, by Albert Eichler, and of Banquo's ghost by G. von Glasenapp. Lastly, a curious short article by a physician, Dr. A. Guthmann, on Shakespeare's last illness and death may be mentioned, in which the writer argues, mainly from the apparent silence of his last years, when we should have expected him to be still in full command of his faculties, and from certain peculiarities of the Stratford Bust, that from about 1612 he was suffering from arterio-sclerosis. It is of course possible.

The Review of Periodical Literature and the Bibliography for 1924 have had to be postponed until the next volume.

The Deutsche Shakespeare-Gesellschaft, which in former times used to have so many English and American members, may be warmly recommended to the notice of students. The *Jahrbuch* alone is quite worth the present subscription of 9 M., and while it may be admitted that in the past somewhat exaggerated claims have at times been made for German Shakespearean scholarship, it is mere foolishness to deny that much good work has been accomplished by the Shakespeare-Gesellschaft. It would be re-

* See the *Summary of Periodical Literature* below for the vol. for 1925.

grettable if, after more than sixty years, its activities should be restricted by lack of support.

R. B. McK.

Specimens of Books printed at Oxford with the types given to the University by John Fell, who was born June 23, 1625, died July 10, 1686; Dean of Christ Church, 1660-1686; Bishop of Oxford 1676-1686; Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford, 1666-1669; Delegate of the University Press, 1662-1686. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. In the tercentenary year, 1925. Pp. 127. Price £3 3s.

THE Oxford University Press has celebrated the tercentenary of the birth of its benefactor Bishop Fell very magnificently by reprinting with the types he gave it (recast in recent years on slightly larger bodies) specimen pages from a dozen of its older books (eleven of them dated from 1674 to 1726, with the title-page of the Euripides of 1778), with about twice as many examples of the modern use of the types since their resuscitation by that great printer, Horace Hart. Mr. Hart, with the energy which he put into everything he took in hand, reassembled the types, matrices and punches which had lain unused at the Press for generations, identified them with those shown in the Oxford "specimen" of 1693, and set forth their history in his *Notes on a Century of Typography at the University Press, Oxford, 1693-1794*, published in 1900. The present memorial volume supplements his work by exhibiting in type-facsimile (*i.e.* by re-composing with the same types in exact imitation of the original setting) "examples of the way in which the types were used at Oxford in Fell's own time, in the eighteenth century, and in the period of the modern revival."

It is needless to say that the University Press has put its best work into this memorial volume. The book is printed on a rag paper which looks as if it would last as well as all but the best of those used in the fifteenth century, and takes an excellent impression, and the utmost care has been spent on the press-work. As a result, the Fell types show to better advantage than ever before, the blackness of the excellent ink yielding a brilliancy far greater than that attained in the early editions and putting to some little shame some of the more recent ones also. It is delightful to see such good use made of Bishop Fell's types, but it will be a misfortune if the

honour thus rightly done to him results in these founts of type being regarded as in any way exceptionally good. Ever since William Morris started work there has been a tendency to worry about types. The outcome has been good, for many recent founts, more especially some of the American ones cut for use on monotype machines, are really beautiful. But it remains true that a fine printer can get amazingly good effects with quite ordinary types, and for the future of printing craftsmanship and the appreciation of craftsmanship by book-buyers are more important than prettier type-faces. The care taken with this book makes these Dutch founts, which were the best Bishop Fell and the Oxford University Press could procure at the end of the seventeenth century, pass muster very fairly well. But they are not good types in themselves; the lower case in most of the founts is harmless, but the upper case is frequently very bad, and never good enough to be used in massed majuscules. In some founts the points also are bad, notably in the "English" in which an unobtrusive colon is altogether outweighed by a blatant semicolon and comma. As for the "Flower'd Letters" (*i.e.* ornamental capitals which were used by the Press as early as 1690, though they do not appear in a "specimen" until 1786), they are bad enough to spoil any page on which they appear. Taking these Dutch types as a whole, they are certainly inferior to those with which Caslon drove them out of the English market a generation later. Its possession of matrices and punches already two centuries and a half old will always be one of the many distinctions of the Oxford University Press, which will doubtless continue to use them to good purpose in antiquarian reprints; but it would be a misfortune if the Press by its great reputation procured for these types an extended vogue which they in no way deserve.

A. W. POLLARD.

Le Thème et le Sentiment de la Nature dans la Poésie anglo-saxonne. EMILE PONS. Publications de la faculté des lettres de l'université de Strasbourg. Published in England by Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 4s. net.

IN this discerning study M. Pons is chiefly concerned to trace the elements of the strong feeling for nature displayed in Anglo-Saxon

poetry : the form assumed by the mythical tendency, the realism. and the pervading melancholy. The mythical tendency he considers to be still of great importance, but differing widely from the simple mythical view of nature in the Eddic poems, transformed rather into something complex and metaphysical by the influence of Christianity. This also is responsible for the realistic contemplation of the universe, and for the sense of mortality and the transitoriness of the world. The most complete and noblest expression of the lyrical temper resulting from the fusion of these elements is the poetry of the sea : " *Le lyrisme de la mer est tout imprégné d'inquiétudes métaphysiques ; la beauté des tempêtes pleine du tragique de la mort. Car la mort n'est plus une compagne allègre, avec qui folâtraient les guerriers ; elle est devenue un mystère redoutable, une menace pour les âmes* " (p. 148). In the descriptions of the gentler forms of nature the same blending is shown, and the poet fails only when, as in some of the literature of edification, he forgets his lesson of real observation and depends on his reading.

E. C. B.

OTHER BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS RECEIVED

The John Rylands Library, Manchester : Catalogue of an Exhibition illustrating the History of the Transmission of the Bible. With an Introductory sketch by the Librarian. Manchester : the University Press. 1925. Pp. xii., 133. 1s. 6d. net.

Students will, I think, be glad to have this book brought to their notice, for it is much more than an ordinary catalogue of an exhibition. The Introductory Sketch by Dr. Henry Guppy, which forms nearly half the book, is an excellent and very readable account of the history of the Bible and especially of the English Translations, which puts in concise and convenient form just those things which the student of English literature and history ought to know. The book includes 20 half-tone reproductions of MSS., title-pages, excerpts of various versions, etc.

Antichrist and Adam. Two Mediaeval Religious Dramas, translated into English by SARAH F. BARROW, Ph.D., and WILLIAM H. HULME, Ph.D., with an Introduction by WILLIAM H. HULME. (Western Reserve University Bulletin, Vol. 28, No. 8, August 1925.)

These translations may serve very conveniently to enable students of English to whom the original Latin and Old French present difficulties, to gain an acquaintance with these two important examples of twelfth-century drama. The introduction gives a brief but sufficient account of the plays and of the critical work which has been done on them.

R. B. M'K.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

BY H. WINIFRED HUSBANDS

ANGLIA, Vol. L. (neue Folge Vol. XXXIX.), May 1926—

Beowulfiana (Fr. Klæber), pp. 107-22.

Textual notes.

Walter Savage Landor, I. (Helene Richter), pp. 123-52.

Der Werdegang von John Galsworthys Welt- und Kunstanschauung
(continued) (F. C. Steinermayr), pp. 153-78.

Zu den "Casa Guidi Windows" der Dichterin E. Barrett-Browning
(M. J. Minckwitz), pp. 179-94.

CORNHILL MAGAZINE, May 1926—

The Chronology of Pickwick (F. D. MacKinnon), pp. 537-47.

—July 1926—

An Unpublished Literary Correspondence (W. Forbes Gray),
pp. 77-93.

Collection of Mr. W. F. Watson.

ENGLISH STUDIES, Vol. VIII., June 1926—

Edmund Spenser and Jonker Jan van der Noot, II. (W. J. B. Pienaar),
pp. 67-76.

HERRIG'S ARCHIV FÜR DAS STUDIUM DER NEUEREN SPRACHEN UND
LITERATUREN, Vol. 150 (New Series 50), June 1926—

Ein dramatischer Kunsthandwerker der englischen Renaissance
(A. Munday), Conclusion (Ph. Aronstein), pp. 31-62.

HISTORY, Vol. XI., July 1926—

The Teaching and Practice of Handwriting in England (Hilary
Jenkinson), pp. 130-38.

JOURNAL OF ENGLISH AND GERMANIC PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXV., April
1926—

The Finn Episode in *Beowulf* (Kemp Malone), pp. 157-72.
The attitude of the poet.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 499

Longfellow's *Golden Legend* and the *Armer Heinrich* theme in Modern German Literature (J. T. Krumpelmann), pp. 173-92.

Falstaff Redux (E. C. Knowlton), pp. 193-215.

Falstaff's truth to life considered.

On the Chronology of Shakespeare's Sonnets (Elizabeth Beckwith), pp. 227-42.

Repetition of rare words as test for chronology.

MASK, Vol. 12, July 1926—

A Reproduction of Horwood's Celebrated Eighteenth Century Plan of London (Second Eight Plates).

Some Facts and Dates about London Theatres, and those Associated with them, pp. 100-3.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. XLI., May 1926—

"Standing Water" (W. Roy Mackenzie), pp. 283-93.

Note on *Twelfth Night*, I. v.

Milton's "Old Damocles" (Marjorie H. Nicolson), pp. 293-300.

Suggested identification with Joseph Mead.

The Syntax of "the" with the Comparative (George W. Small), pp. 300-13.

A Chaucerian Echo in Spenser (Robert R. Cawley), pp. 313-14.

Hous of Fame, 2141-51, and *Faerie Queene*, I. iv. 16, ll. 7, 8.

The "Lucy" Poems (Walter Pennington), pp. 314-16.

Identification of heroine with Lucy Gray.

A Note on "Corones Two" (Roscoe E. Parker), pp. 317-18.

Source of reference in *Second Nun's Tale*, 220-21.

Tintinnabulation (C. B. Cooper), p. 318.

Possible source of Poe's word.

Another Forgotten Novel (Clifford A. Bender), pp. 319-22.

The Money-Makers—an answer to *The Breadwinners*.

Milton's Popularity in the Eighteenth Century (Alfred E. Richards), p. 322.

Evidence of Moritz' *Reisen eines Deutschen in England im Jahr 1782*.

Two Notes on Spenser's Classical Sources (Edwin Greenlaw), pp. 323-26.

Apollonius Rhodius and Hesiod.

A Handful of Pleasant Delights (Hyder E. Rollins), p. 327.

Date of first edition.

A Note on *Peregrine Pickle* and *Pygmalion* (E. S. Noyes), pp. 327-30.

The Anatomist Dissected, by Lemuel Gulliver (William A. Eddy), pp. 330-31.

—June 1926—

Hellenic and Beowulfian Shields and Spears (A. S. Cook), pp. 360-63.

Elizabethan Players as Tradesfolk (W. J. Lawrence), pp. 363-64.

The Rolls of Parliament and the New English Dictionary (Frederick E. Faverty), pp. 375-78.

Use of words earlier than quotations in *N.E.D.*

"Leyde here legges aliri" (Hoxie N. Fairchild), pp. 378-81.

Note on *Piers Plowman*, B. VI. 124.

Mrs. Montagu, Churchill, and Miss Cheere (Joseph M. Beatty, Jr.), pp. 384-86.

An Early Seventeenth Century Criticism of Spenser (F. F. Covington, Jr.), pp. 386-87.

In Heywood's *Hierarchie of the Blessed Angells*.

Authorship of *The British Grammar* (Arthur G. Kennedy), pp. 388-91.
Evidence for authorship of James Buchanan.

The *Merchant's Tale* in Chaucer Junior (Willard Farnham), pp. 392-96.

Concerning, the seventeenth-century jest-book entitled *Canterbury Tales*.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW, Vol. XXI., July 1926—

The Maidstone Text of the *Proverbs of Alfred* (Carleton Brown), pp. 249-60.

James Melvill: An Obscured Man of Letters (Marjory A. Bald), pp. 261-68.

Sir John Denham's *Cooper's Hill* (Theodore H. Banks), pp. 269-77.

Gaimar and the Edgar-Ælfðryð Story (A. Bell), pp. 278-87.

Notes on Old English Poetry (W. S. Mackie), pp. 300-1.

On *Riddle*, xxvii. 15-17; *The Exile's Prayer*; *Beowulf*, 223-4.

"Ealu-scerwen" (S. V. Crawford), pp. 302-3.

Note on *Beowulf*, 769.

The Source of Watson's *Tears of Fancie* (Janet G. Scott), pp. 303-6.

MODERN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXIII., May 1926—

The Punctuation of *Beowulf* and Literary Interpretation (O. F. Emerson), pp. 393-405.

Play-Lists and Afterpieces of the Mid-Eighteenth Century (C. R. Baskerville), pp. 445-64.

The Borderers as a Document in the History of Wordsworth's Æsthetic Development (O. J. Campbell and P. Mueschke), pp. 465-82.

Studies in English Phonology, II.; *AI* (Kemp Malone), pp. 483-90.

NINETEENTH CENTURY AND AFTER, Vol. XCIX., March 1926—

Blake: An Æsthetic Approach (Anthony Bertram), pp. 442-49.

—May 1926—

Wordsworth's *Prelude* (Helen Darbishire), pp. 718-31.

The Tour of Coleridge and his Friend Hucks in Wales in 1794 (Herbert Wright), pp. 732-44.

NINETEENTH CENTURY AND AFTER, Vol. XCIX., June 1926—

Farming in Shakespeare's Time (Henry Rew), pp. 857-68.

Matthew Arnold and Some French Poets (V. L. Romer), pp. 869-80.

—July 1926—

The Scottish Literary Renaissance (Lewis Spence), pp. 123-33.

—August 1926—

Emily Brontë's Poems: Some Textual Corrections and Unpublished Verses (Davidson Cook), pp. 248-62.

Keats and the *Golden Ass* (B. Ifor Evans), pp. 263-71.

The Time-Scheme of the First Series of Shakespeare's Sonnets (J. A. Fort), pp. 272-79.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 150, May 1, 1926—

The Laughton or Herb Garden (S. O. Addy), p. 309.

Occurrence in place-names.

Rotten Row (F. Williamson), p. 315.

Other occurrences of name.

—May 8—

"Portmanteau" words again (Robert Withington), pp. 328-9.

—May 15—

Etymology of "Guinea" (Fonchy), p. 350.

Suggested derivation from Guienne.

—May 29—

A Problem of Early English History (Andrew Potts), pp. 383-5.

British enclaves among Anglo-Saxon settlements.

—June 12—

Day and Wilkins as Collaborators (S. R. Golding), pp. 417-21.

Concluded, June 19, pp. 436-8.

Hamlet: An Amendment (F. H. Underwood), p. 422.

Note on I. iv. 36-8. Further note by C. F. Hardy, July 24, p. 67.

—June 19—

Shakespeare's First Folio (Appleton Morgan), pp. 435-6.

Supposed part played by Richard James.

—July 3—

The Earldom of Huntingdon: Robin Hood (J. B. McGovern), pp. 7-8.

Evidence for tradition. Further note by F. G. Mackereth, July 24, pp. 64-5.

—July 10—

Timon of Athens (H. Dugdale Sykes), pp. 21-3.

On question of authorship.

Newly Identified Lines by Southey (T. O. Mabbott), p. 26.

Three lines in Maria Brooks' *Zéphir*.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 150, July 17—

Bacon and "The Huddler" (Harold Hardy), pp. 39-41.

—July 24—

Blake's "Heads of the Poets" (K. Povey), pp. 57-8.

—July 31—

Textual Notes on some Passages in *Hamlet* (Henry Cuningham), pp. 75-6.

On I. iii. 65 and I. iii. 70-74.

The Place-Name Desborough (Alfred Anscombe), p. 78.

Hamlet in Folk-Speech (W. R. N. Baron), pp. 78-9.

"Deal Faithfully with" = Rebuke (John B. Wainwright), p. 79.

PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, Vol. V., July 1926—

Thomas Blackwell, a Disciple of Shaftesbury (Lois Whitney), pp. 196-211.

Greek Parallels to Certain Features of the *Beowulf* (A. S. Cook), pp. 226-34.

The Early History of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* in England (Marvin T. Herrick), pp. 242-57.

A Note on the Areopagus (Frederic E. Faverty), pp. 278-80.

On the use of the word by Spenser.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, Vol. XLI., June 1926—

Notes on the Cardigan Chaucer Manuscript (Clara Marburg), pp. 229-51.

Collation of significant passages.

Saint Ambrose and Chaucer's Life of St. Cecilia (O. F. Emerson), pp. 252-61.

Note on *Canterbury Tales*, G. 271 ff.

The Social Status of Chaucer's Franklin (G. H. Gerould), pp. 262-79.

The Sources of Drayton's *Battaile of Agincourt* (Raymond Jenkins), pp. 280-93.

A Probable Source of Beaumont and Fletcher's *Philaster* (T. P. Harrison, Jr.), pp. 294-303.

Montemayor's *Diana*.

The Trial of Chivalry, a Chettle Play (Fred L. Jones), pp. 304-24.

Evidence for Chettle's authorship.

Thomas Randolph's Part in the Authorship of *Hey for Honesty* (Cyrus L. Day), pp. 325-34.

English Translations of Homer (J. N. Douglas Bush), pp. 335-41.

Bibliographical.

Essays and Letter Writing (Harold C. Binkley), pp. 342-61.

Whig Panegyric Verse, 1700-1760 (C. A. Moore), pp. 362-401.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 503

Points of Contact between Byron and Socrates (Elizabeth Atkins), pp. 402-23.

The Views of the Great Critics on the Historical Novel (Ernest Bernbaum), pp. 424-41.

Sainte Beuve and Pope (Lander MacClintock), pp. 442-51.
Extent of Pope's influence.

REVUE ANGLO-AMÉRICAIN, June 1926—

La fille brune (The Nut-brown Maid) (E. Legouis), pp. 385-96.

A translation keeping the original metre, with introductory note.

Carlyle et l'Insurrection des Femmes (J. Douady), pp. 397-409.

Walt Whitman pendant la Guerre de Sécession d'après des documents inédits (J. Catel), pp. 410-19.

Un mouvement de renaissance théâtrale en Ecosse (fin) (R. Leclercq), pp. 420-27.

Shakespeare, Chapman et *Sir Thomas More* (Franck L. Schoell et Arthur Acheson), pp. 428-39.

SHAKESPEARE JAHRBUCH, Vol. 61 (New Series 2), 1925—

Shakespeare und die Mode des Tags (E. Kilian), pp. 8-38.

Die Hofbühnenmässige in Shakespeare's *Midsummer Night's Dream* (A. Eichler), pp. 39-51.

Die Dämonologie in Shakespeare's *Macbeth*: Banquo's Geist (G. von Glasenapp), pp. 52-66.

Franz Liszt's Stellung zu Shakespeare (F. Schnapp), pp. 67-80.

Der Totenschädel in Hamlet's Hand (H. Türck), pp. 81-88.

Shakespeare's Krankheit und Tod (A. Guthmann), pp. 89-93.

Hat Calderon Shakespeare gekannt? (Maria Schütt), pp. 94-107.

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXIII., July 1926—

Browning's Source for *The Pied Piper of Hamelin* (Arthur Dickson), pp. 327-36.

Gabriel Harvey's References to Marlowe (Hale Moore), pp. 337-57.

A Late Eighteenth-Century Purist (W. F. Bryan), pp. 358-70.

George Campbell's *Philosophy of Rhetoric*.

Pitch Patterns in English (Kemp Malone), pp. 371-9.

Chaucer's "Colle Tregetour" (James F. Royster), pp. 380-4.

Note on *Hous of Fame*, 1277-81.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, April 8, 1926—

The Date of *Hamlet* (W. J. Lawrence), p. 263.

Evidence in favour of 1600. Further letter, May 20, p. 339.

—May 20—

The First London Edition of *The Querist* (E. H. W. Meyerstein), p. 339.

Textual Errors in Stevenson (J. D. Hamilton and A. J. Bird), p. 339.
Catriona, chap. xix.

A Letter of Keats (L. J. Potts), p. 339.
 Suggested emendation.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, May 27—

Scott's Diary and *Woodstock* (1826), pp. 345-46.

Christopher Smart (Edmund Gosse), p. 355.

Unpublished letter of 7.1.47-8. Note by G. J. Gray, July 1, p. 448.

A Conversation with Wordsworth (X.), p. 355.

Recorded by Bonamy Price. Further note by L. R. M. Strachan, June 3, p. 374.

Nathaniel and Nathan Field (T. W. Baldwin), p. 355.

Reply by W. W. Greg, June 3, p. 374.

Blake Drawings (J. P. R. Wallis), p. 355.

Note on the Ellis and Yeats facsimile of *Milton*, plates 16 and 42.

King Arthur's Country (Mabel Bowen), p. 355.

Further note by W. R. Lethaby, June 3, p. 374.

The Text of *Typee* (H. S. Milford), p. 355.

————June 3—

The Essence of Verse, pp. 361-62.

Bernicia or Beruicia (William Ridgeway), p. 374.

Further note by Edward J. Thomas, June 17, p. 414.

————June 10—

Johnson's Ushership at Market Bosworth (Aleyn Lyell Reade),
 p. 394.

Notes on Percy's *Reliques* (C. R. Reeve), p. 394.

Further notes by Alda Milner-Barry, July 1, p. 448; and by George
 Gordon, July 8, p. 464.

Song and Drama (F. S. Boas), p. 394.

On the songs in Lyly's plays. Reply by W. J. Lawrence, June 17, p. 414.
 Discussion continued by Edward A. Bunyard and A. R. Cripps, June 24,
 p. 432; C. L. Quinton, July 1, p. 448; A. S. Lupton, July 8, p. 464.

————June 17—

What did Blake mean by Sculpture? (Frank Granger), p. 414.

A Caricature of Johnson (Kenneth Povey), p. 414.

In Hayley's *The Mausoleum*.

An Old English Riddle (W. J. Blyth Crotch), p. 414.

Interpretation of "Sun and Moon" Riddle.

Sheridan Bibliography (R. Crompton Rhodes), p. 414.

————June 24—

A Quotation of Charles Lamb's (F. D. MacKinnon), p. 432.

Note on *The Old Benchers of the Inner Temple*.

"Motley" (Valery Larbaud), p. 432.

Note on Shakespeare's Sonnet, cx., l. 2.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, July 1—

Swinburne and Lord Morley (Georges Lafourcade), p. 448.

The Derivation of London (Walter Rye), p. 448.

Molinos and *John Inglesant* (Montague Summers), p. 448.

Source of one incident. Further notes by H. W. Davies, July 8, p. 464 ;
Montague Summers and H. C. Foxcroft, July 15, p. 480 ; F. S. Ferguson,
July 22, p. 496.

—July 8—

Hamlet and the Sources (F. A. Bather), p. 464.

Robinson Crusoe (Constable and Co.), p. 464.

Reprint not from first edition.

—July 15—

Wordsworth's First Love (Anton Bertram), p. 480.

Reply by Gordon G. Wordsworth, July 22, p. 496.

The Happy Hypocrite (William Talbot), p. 480.

Date of first edition.

—July 22—

The Poet Gray and the Rev. Henry Etough (John Beresford),
pp. 495-496.

—July 29—

Blake's Prophetic Books (Mark E. Perugini), p. 512.

Possible clue to interpretation of names.

"Woo't drink up Eisel? Eat a Crocodile?" (F. L. Lucas), p. 512.

Note on *Hamlet*, V. i. 261 ff.

The Etymology of Durham (William Ridgeway), p. 512.

Jane Austen's Letters (R. W. Chapman), p. 512.

Corrections in letter to Anne Sharp, 22.5.1817.

UNIVERSITY EXAMINATION RESULTS, 1926

B.A. with Honours in English Language and Literature.

BELFAST.—English Literature :

Class I.—J. Harbison.

Class II.—J. N. Browne, A. D. Davey, Jane Huxley, Mary K. Maybin, Isabel S. Mogeey.

Class III.—Muriel F. A. McGonigal, Grace Scott.

BIRMINGHAM.—English :

Class I.—Anne Cecil Molloy.

Class II.—J. L. Bowers, Amphilis Erica Chattock Carter, F. R. Cooper, Mary Isobel Prescott Crowder, Dorothy Mary Farr, Dorothy Julia Gaskarth, Marjorie Graham, E. A. Lewis, Phyllis May Lewis, Muriel Ellen Needham, A. V. Smith, Enid Margaret Spinks, W. T. Ward, Hilda Beatrice Williams.

Class III.—Constance Mary Cottle Appleton, J. H. Bowman, Vera Maude Haynes, Audrey Edith Ince, Mary Isidora Lewis, Phyllis Mary Paynting, Elizabeth Sullivan, B. A. Whitehead.

Classified on completion of subsidiary requirements.

Class II.—R. Davies.

Class III.—R. M. Beavan.

BRISTOL.—English :

Class II.—Div. 1 :—Williamina Agnes Strachan Wilson Gilroy.
Div. 2 : Ida Constance Barralet, N. F. Hulbert, Winifred Iles, Nancy Noel Ravenhill Stock.

Class III.—Ellen Mary Heath.

CAMBRIDGE.—English Tripos :

Class I.—A. F. Clutton Brock (*A*) (King's), C. V. Deane * (*B*) (Emm.), H. O'N. Hencken (*B*) (Joh.), A. S. Oswald (*A*) (Queens'), A. P. Rossiter, (*A*) (Selw.), J. Scupham (*A*) (Emm.), J. E. Sewell * (*A*) (Joh.), P. Wilson (*A*) (Jes.).

Class II.—Div. 1 : J. H. Appleby (*a*) (King's), C. E. Cuthbertson (*a*) (Queens'), H. Dew (*a*) (non-coll.), S. French (*a*) (Down.), G. C. Gardiner (*a*) (Joh.), M. D. Gray (*a*) (Emm.), H. J. C. Herrick, (*a*) (Joh.),

UNIVERSITY EXAMINATION RESULTS, 1926 507

J. H. Lush (*a*) (Joh.), H. I. Nelson (*a*) (Down.), B. N. Reckitt (*a*) (King's), C. A. Scrimgeour (*a*) (Christ's), R. R. Williams (*a*) (Cai.). Div. 2 : J. A. Alderson (*a*) (Down.), H. MacA. Bell (*b*) (Cla.), C. H. Bishop (*a*) (Emm.), W. T. Bissell (*a*) (Trin.), K. G. R. Bloomfield (*a*) (Trin. H.), A. W. Breed (*a*) (Emm.), H. M. Brodie (*a*) (Pet.), J. H. Chesshyre-Walker (*a*) (Trin.), A. I. Forde (*a*) (Queens'), A. G. Hickson (*a*) (Magd.), K. E. Ingoldby (*a*) (Cai.), E. W. Kent (*a*) (Cla.), W. M. Knight (*a*) (Cath.), A. Lee (*b*) (Trin.), S. M. Lehrman (*a*) (Emm.), L. R. Manthorp (*a*) (Selw.), R. S. Morris (*a*) (Emm.), D. M. Parren (*a*) (non-coll.), S. J. Postlethwaite (*a*) (Christ's), F. R. Price (*a*) (Cai.), C. E. G. Pritchard (*a*) (Christ's), R. C. Roberts (*a*) (Christ's), G. Russell-Fisher (*a*) (Joh.), J. B. Rustonjee (*a*) (Cai.), R. E. Swartwout (*a*) (Trin.), J. Torbarina (*a*) (Queens'), J. M. Upward (*a*) (Sid. Suss.), D. C. Whimster (*a*) (Trin.), M. O. Willmore (*a*) (Jes.), E. M. Wilson (*a*) (Trin.).

Class III.—C. W. H. Bell (*a*) (Trin.), W. T. Bett (*a*) (Pemb.), T. H. H. Blair (*a*) (Emm.), E. C. Butterworth (*a*) (Christ's), A. B. B. Cartledge (*a*) (Selw.), R. L. Chalmers-Hunt (*a*) (Christ's), J. B. Chutter (*a*) (Cath.), W. L. Clarke (*a*) (Pemb.), M. C. Cocks (*a*) (non-coll.), E. W. Ellison (*a*) (Queens'), A. H. R. Elton (*a*) (Jes.), F. M. Forbes (*a*) (Cai.), J. R. Higginson (*a*) (Emm.), C. D. Horsley (*a*) (Queens'), P. A. Hurd (*a*) (Emm.), T. F. Long (*b*) (Christ's), D. McLellan (*a*) (Queens'), R. A. Macleod (*a*) (Trin.), R. R. Merttens (*a*) (Cath.), H. P. Nangle (*a*) (Sid. Suss.), J. H. G. Pell (*a*) (Queens'), A. H. Pringle (*a*) (Queens'), C. R. Sanderson (*a*) (Pet.), J. R. Sherborne (*a*) (Emm.), A. G. Smith (*a*) (Christ's), D. Smith (*a*) (Trin.), B. Sowerby (*a*) (Pemb.), W. J. Steer (*a*) (Sid. Suss.), T. S. P. Swinburne (*a*) (Trin.), A. S. Winder (*a*) (Pet.), J. B. Wyllie (*a*) (Emm.).

Ægotat.—D. J. V. Hamilton-Miller (*a*) (Jes.).

WOMEN.

Class I.—M. E. H. Jenkins, (*A*) (Newn.), M. Sykes (*A*) (Newn.).

Class II.—Div. 1 : S. M. S. Archer (*a*) (Newn.), M. A. Ash (*b*) (Newn.), G. V. Cohen (*b*) (Girton), A. L. E. Coy (*a*) (Newn.), N. M. Davis (*a*) (Girton), L. J. H. Grierson (*a*) (Girton), E. E. Irvine (*a*) (Newn.), B. Kerly (*a*) (Newn.), B. Malnick (*a*) (Newn.), H. Murrell (*a*) (Newn.), M. Robinson (*a*) (Newn.), M. Walton (*a*) (Newn.). Div. 2 : A. F. J. Ashley (*a*) (Newn.), A. M. Blair (*a*) (Girton), E. Bond (*b*) (Girton), H. J. Booyesen (*a*) (Newn.), J. C. B. Bulman (*b*) (Newn.), E. V. E. Clark (*b*) (Girton), H. G. Coleman (*a*) (Newn.), M. E. Currant (*a*) (Newn.), M. G. Davies (*b*) (Newn.), S. V. Devadoss (*a*) (Girton), W. J. M. Eyles (*b*) (Girton), E. J. Giffin (*a*) (Newn.), A. M. F. Gough (*b*) (Girton), E. M. Heffer (*a*) (Girton), M. K. B. Hodgkinson (*a*) (Newn.), D. Isherwood (*a*) (Newn.), H. E. Rees (*a*) (Newn.), S. Senecviratne (*a*) (Girton), S. R. Steen (*a*) (Newn.), K. M. Wickett (*a*) (Newn.), M. J. Williams (*a*) (Newn.), C. E. S. Wood (*a*) (Girton).

Class III.—E. Falcon (*a*) (Newn.), M. E. H. V. Jones (*b*) (Girton),

I. R. McMorran (*b*) (Girton), N. M. Neve (*b*) (Girton), M. Williams (*b*) (Newn.).

Ægotant.—J. E. Jewson (*b*) (Girton), E. G. Joy (*a*) (Girton).

a = passed in English Literature, Modern and Medieval; *b* = in Early Literature and History. A capital letter denotes that a candidate is placed in the First Class for proficiency in that section.

An asterisk denotes special distinction.

DURHAM.—English :

Class II.—Jane Bryson, L. Caisley, Florence Hall, Mary Lickiss, George Mack, and Bessie Maconachie (Armstrong Coll.).

LEEDS.—English :

Class I.—Annie Brooks, Elizabeth S. Olszewska.

Class II.—G. R. Ashton, Patricia C. Beaumont, Marjorie Best, W. J. Bolt, D. Hawson, Lilian Hutchinson, Marjorie Leather, Olga O. Palmer, B. C. Pearson, Ethel Veitch, Alice Walls.

LIVERPOOL.—English :

Class I.—Theodora Barnsley, Vera T. Jones, Blanche Meyrick, Lilian M. Shaw, H. G. Taylor.

Class II.—Div. 1 : Hélène Davies, Doris E. Gibbs, Winefred Gill, Marion A. Poppleton, Elsie Walker. Div. 2 : Sylvia Applebaum, Kathleen Considine, Elizabeth Henderson, Elsie B. Hunt, Veronica M. Nichols, Nancy Nixon.

LONDON (Internal).—English.

Class I.—Mary L. Bromley (George Smith Studentship) (Ryl. Holl. C.), Elizabeth M. H. Cooke (Ryl. Holl. C.), Marjorie V. Cox (U. C.), Hilda M. Craig (Bedf. C.), Emily R. Crossley (Birkbeck C.), G. R. Hammond (U. C.), T. C. Rising (King's C.), Ruby M. Scrimgeour (King's C.), Faith O. H. Spackman (King's C.).

Class II.—Div. 1 : Margaret B. Brown (Bedf. C.), Audrey O. Carr (King's C.), Alda M. Connor (Bedf. C.), Gwyneth H. Cornwell (King's C.), G. E. Dennis (U. C.), Gladys H. Finch (East Lond. C.), Eileen E. G. Garson (King's C.), Gladys E. Glazier (Bedf. C.), Joan Harrison (Bedf. C.), Maud S. Jaques (Bedf. C.), Helena T. Lawson (East Lond. C.), Dorothy I. Maw (Bedf. C.), Clare Phillips (Westfield C.), Monica M. Roberts (Bedf. C.), R. S. Rule (King's C.), Marjorie Rushforth (U. C.), W. R. Rutland (U. C.). Div. 2 : Barbara M. Baxter (King's C.), H. Beeken (East Lond. C.), Margaret M. Bell (King's C.), Elaine R. Brown (King's C.), Olive B. Copping (King's C.), Grace W. Dennis (Westfield C.), Constance I. Dewar (U. C.), Ada E. Gardner (U. C.), Amy Goldsbrough (Birkbeck C.), Rosalie E. Guy (Westfield C.), Violet C. Hammond (Bedf. C.), E. H. Houghton (King's C.), Florence D. Jackson (Bedf. C.), Mary G. Jones (Birkbeck C.), Marjorie E. Lambert (Westfield C.), Evelyn M. Legge (Bedf. C.), Miriam Liebster (U. C.), Jean O. McBryde (Ryl. Holl. C.), Dora Mason (Bedf. C.), Grace A. Mason, (Birkbeck C.), Alice G. Matthews (Ryl. Holl. C.), Doris M. Midgley (Ryl. Holl. C.), Kathleen

B. Millman (King's C.), Kathleen Murphy (East Lond. C.), Marjorie M. Nolan (East Lond. C.), Marjorie J. Oddie (U. C.), Phyllis M. Page (Bedf. C.), A. M. Parish (East Lond. C.), Olga B. Priestman (Westfield C.), Florence V. Rees (Birkbeck C.), Netta M. Richardson (Birkbeck C.), Marjorie Sale (Ryl. Holl. C.), Janet E. Simpson (Ryl. Holl. C.), J. W. Smith (King's C.), Margaret Spurway (Ryl. Holl. C.), S. J. Steane (U. C.), Edith Townsend (King's C.), Doreen W. Urwick (Ryl. Holl. C.), Kathleen L. Vinall (Ryl. Holl. C.), F. T. Wood (East Lond. C.): Milly Black (U. C.), Marjorie Coutts (U. C.), H. Spooner (U. C.).

Class III.—Olive M. Barford (U. C.), Mary A. Brunning (East Lond. C.), Gladys E. A. Budd (King's C.), Susie U. Burt (U. C.), Elisabeth J. A. Cluer (U. C.), Edna M. Dennis (King's C.), Enid J. Drayton (Ryl. Holl. C.), D. J. Firman (U. C.), A. Jackson (U. C.), Lucy W. James (Westfield C.), Gladys S. B. Leakey (U. C.), Rosa P. Mason (Birkbeck C.), Muriel G. Moyle (Bedf. C.), Gladys A. Mugford (King's C.), Mabel Orchard (King's C.), Monica W. Powell (Westfield C.), G. L. B. Simpson (East Lond. C.), S. H. Stewart (King's C.), Irene C. Uttley (Westfield C.).

LONDON (External). English.

Class I.—G. C. Triffitt (U. C., Nott.)

Class II.—Div. 1: W. C. Astle (U. C., Nott.), Freida Brookes (U. C., South.), Winifred M. Daykin (Reading), S. E. F. Hammond (U. C., Ex.), E. Webb (U. C., South.), Lily M. Winfield (U. C., Nott.). Div. 2: T. R. Bailey (U. C., Ex.), Margery I. Baker (U. C., South.), R. H. Beagle (Reading), C. B. Beer (Priv.), Dorothy M. Butters (Reading), P. G. Calladine (Priv.), N. G. Cottrell (U. C., Ex.), Mary Davies (Reading), J. A. Doyle (Priv.), Mary S. Elgin (Notre Dame, L'pool), N. J. Fishlock (Priv.), Margery P. Helmore (U. C., Ex.), Mary J. Henderson (Priv.), Winifred Jacob (Reading), J. Lodge (Priv.), A. Muir (U. C., Ex.), E. R. Moss (C. of St. Mark and St. John), Elsie M. Mynett (U. C., Nott.), H. L. Salmon (Reading), Cicely E. Stone (U. C., South.), J. Stratton (Priv.), G. C. Thornley (Priv.), Louisa D. Watkins (U. C., South.), Lorna M. White (U. C., Nott.).

Class III.—Louisa M. Baker (Ladies' C., Cheltenham), P. G. S. Baylis (Priv.), Marie E. Bertram (Notre Dame, L'pool), J. J. Boland (Priv.), D. M. M. Branson (U. C., Nott.), Margery W. Breton (Priv.), Dorothy Browning (Priv.), Mary W. Bullows (Priv.), Kathleen M. S. Byfield (U. C., Ex. and Priv.), Annie Byrne (East Lond. C.), Winifred E. Clarkson (Reading), C. V. Cockram (Priv.), J. A. Craig (U. C., Ex.), J. J. Creaven (Priv.), Margery E. Dell (U. C., Ex.), Dorothy L. Denman (U. C., Ex.), Dora M. Downes (Priv.), Alice M. Few (East Lond. C. and Priv.), Evalene M. Fowler (Priv.), H. W. Izzard (C. of St. Mark and St. John), Mary P. Kibble (Reading), Kathleen Y. Knight (U. C., South.), M. McGuire (Priv.), T. P. Mulvany (Priv.), A. D. Nash (U. C., Nott.), W. Owens (Priv.), Lois E. Parish (U. C., Ex.), Constance O. Paston (Priv.), A. H. Pavey (Priv.), C. Pengelly (U. C., Ex.), K. Pengelly (U. C., Ex.), Frieda Perrett (Priv.), Audrey B. Robertson (Reading), H. C.

Rogers (Priv.), Kathleen S. C. Rowe (Reading), F. E. Salter (U. C., Nott.), Gweneth K. Smalley (U. C., Leicester), Viola J. Strawbridge (Ladies' C., Cheltenham), J. Tillet (U. C., Nott.), F. C. P. Wheeler (U. C., Nott.), V. E. Williams (Priv.), L. Wood (Priv.).

MANCHESTER.—English Language and Literature :

Class I.—Margaret E. Black, Ann Kirkman.

Class II.—Div. 1 : Beatrice A. Baker, Beryl Franks, Muriel Green, Muriel P. Greenwood, Emily M. Kenyon, Agnes D. McLullich, Elizabeth Ogden, Mary Salmons, Florence White. Div. 2 : Edna Cornelius, Hilda Cowell, Jessie Crossfield, Ada Martin, Kathleen M. Martin, Mary M. Miller, Agnes Pearce, Elsie Plinston.

Class III.—A. E. Bimrose, Doris M. Jones, Mary T. Kirkup.

OXFORD.—English Language and Literature :

Class I.—J. F. Waterhouse (Merton) : Agnes M. C. Latham (Som.).

Class II.—W. M. Blackburn (Hert.), S. R. Clark (Ball.), W. A. Claydon (Ball.), A. C. Corlett (St. Ed. Hall), H. H. Davis (Exeter), L. R. Delves Broughton (Univ.), D. A. Dhruva (non-coll.), A. E. Filsell (New Coll.), R. W. D. Fuller (Mert.), C. H. C. Haines (Keble), A. L. Haley (non-coll.), F. C. Horwood (non-coll.), W. A. Jenkins (Ball.), R. Krauss (Exeter), E. C. Mason (non-coll.), J. MacD. Minifie (Oriel), P. Parker (St. John's), A. A. Roberts (Ch. Ch.), C. R. Spencer (Magd.), R. C. Tait (Keble), B. A. Teats (Pemb.), M. Y. Watson (Ch. Ch.), G. W. Whiteman (Queen's) : Janet B. Adam Smith (Som.), Winifred M. Burt (St. Hug.), Clare C. Carr (L. M. H.), Winifred M. Chadband (H.-S.), Katherine M. Facey (L. M. H.), Hilda K. Garvin (Som.), Annie Hadfield (St. Hug.), Pauline C. Harris (H.-S.), Mary F. Hazel (H.-S.), Dorothy M. Hills (St. Hild.), Helen R. Humphrey (Som.), Christina Hyde (Som.), Vera C. Jennings (St. Hild.), Kathleen C. Jones (Som.), Elizabeth M. B. Lang (L. M. H.), Alice Lightfoot (H.-S.), Helena R. MacInnes (L. M. H.), Ethel D. Maddock (St. Hug.), Hope Philip Smith (Som.), P. Seethammal (St. Hild.), Margaret P. Sichel (Som.), Edith A. Standen (Som.), Christina van Heyningen (Som.), Phebe M. Walker (St. Hug.), Margaret Wattie (Som.), Phyllis M. Wilkins (Som.), Elizabeth I. Williams (St. Hild.), Nina B. Woodcock (St. Hug.).

Class III.—J. G. S. Barrow (Univ.), C. F. R. Bell (Hertford), J. F. Bleasdale (St. Ed. Hall), A. C. Braine-Hartnell (Univ.), D. G. Fildes (Ball.), G. E. Gunner (non-coll.), F. N. Hale (St. John's), C. D. B. Harmsworth (Ch. Ch.), R. E. Huston (Mert.), J. I. King (Jes.), L. E. G. Laughton (Keble), R. H. Lunn (Worc.), R. E. Lyman (Univ.), M. J. Mounsey (Mert.), I. C. Nanda (St. John's), F. H. Phillips (Pemb.), C. V. Pilkington (Ch. Ch.), B. Rosenbaum (non-coll.), J. H. A. Rusbridger (St. Ed. Hall), R. W. Speaight (Linc.), A. H. Stevenson (B.N.C.), P. Stott (Jes.), A. C. Tarbat (Keble), R. P. S. Waddy (Ball.), K. M. Willey (Ball.), J. J. Wiseman (non-coll.) : Sylvia J. Baker (St. Hug.), Beryl F. Buckland (H.-S.), Margaret Bumstead (L. M. H.), Edith J. L'E. Burges (H.-S.), Elizabeth I. Cherrill (St. Hild.), Mary L. Clarkson (St. Hug.),

UNIVERSITY EXAMINATION RESULTS, 1926 511

Gladys M. D. Derham (H.-S.), Mabel W. Dingwall (St. Hug.), Kathleen E. Dyer (St. Hild.), Elizabeth C. Eggleston (H.-S.), Frances J. D. England (L. M. H.), Mary I. L. Evans (St. Hug.), Enid M. Foster (St. Hild.), Madeleine E. Horn (St. Hug.), Nan A. Keys (St. Hug.), Helen Malcolm (St. Hild.), Constance E. Manning (H.-S.), Eunice F. Morse (St. Hug.), Gertrude M. Morton (St. Hug.), Dorothy N. Neal (St. Hug.), Helen M. Palmer (H.-S.), Dorothea E. Platt (St. Hug.), Genone M. W. Savory (Som.), Doreen J. Seale (H.-S.), Agatha Short (H.-S.), Margaret M. Smith (L. M. H.), Janet M. A. Stott (H.-S.), Grace E. Tyte (H.-S.), Muriel I. Wiggan (Som.), Grace I. Wilson (H.-S.), Kathleen S. Wright (L. M. H.).

Class IV.—J. D. Boyle (Univ.), J. H. L. Burnett (Linc.), E. W. Eardley (Worc.), H. N. Evans (Wadh.), M. A. E. Franklin (Queen's), P. J. Glasgow (Magd.), H. O. Hobart (Linc.), I. B. G. Hopkin-James (Jes.), C. J. P. Hudson (Wadh.), K. O. Lane (Jes.), A. E. Pritchard (Linc.), H. K. Schaufler (Wadh.), P. K. Sett (Exeter): Sheila Blake (H.-S.), Olive Davey (H.-S.), Diana E. St. H. Gibbons (St. Hild.), Margaret Mathias (St. Hug.), Lucy R. M. Speakman (H.-S.), Vera H. Watkins (St. Hild.), Sylvia B. Yates (H.-S.).

Agrotat.—G. W. Stonier (Ch. Ch.).

Overstanding Satisfied the Examiners.—Sophie F. Rainer (St. Hild.).

Satisfied the examiners in Group B.6.—G. E. P. Collins (Wadh.) and F. A. G. Douglas (Kebble).

SHEFFIELD.—English:

Class II.—Div. 1: Kathleen Brown, Dorothy C. Henstock, Dorothea M. Nicholson. Div. 2: Florence A. Booth, L. Buchan, Eva L. Titcumb.

Class III.—Cicely B. Hughes.

WALES.—English.

Class I.—F. W. Evans (Card.), D. G. James (Aber.), J. C. Llewellyn (Swan.), E. J. Shannon (Aber.), Violet Watson (Aber.).

Class II.—Div. 1: W. R. Butcher (Card.), Doris E. Carter (Aber.), J. Cook (Card.), Doris A. Davies (Card.), Eirene E. Davies (Aber.), T. N. Dowse (Card.), Dilys Evans (Aber.), D. B. Francis (Swan.), W. John (Card.), D. L. Jones (Aber.), J. S. Jones (Card.), T. T. Jones (Aber.), Idris W. Lewys-Lloyd (Aber.), Gwyneth Morris (Aber.), V. T. Y. Noott (Aber.), Gwendoline B. Phillips (Card.), P. C. Ralls (Card.), G. A. Rees (Swan.), S. G. Rees (Aber.), Dyfrig P. Thomas (Card.), Gwyneth M. Thomas (Swan.), Martha G. Williams (Aber.), Rosalind M. E. Williams (Card.). Div. 2: Margaret M. Bevan (Card.), Elizabeth M. Davies (Card.), Vera Davies (Card.), Ethel L. Freeman (Aber.), Dorothy M. Grace (Card.), Rachel M. Griffiths (Aber.), Mildred G. Johnson (Card.), R. T. Jones (Bangor), Margaret E. Lloyd (Aber.), Mary G. Plunkett (Aber.), Edith V. Rowlands (Aber.), Jessie Sutherland (Card.), Marjorie E. M. K. Sutton (Card.), W. G. Williams (Aber.).

Class III.—Dorothy M. Beedle (Bangor), C. J. German (Card.), H. G. Jones (Aber.), Megan G. Jones (Card.), Margaret Petyt (Aber.), Amy P. R. Starke (Card.), Elizabeth D. Williams (Aber.).

M.A. with Honours.

ABERDEEN.—English :

Class I.—Mary Lawson Philp Duncan, I. Macdonald, Dorothy Jean Stewart, Annabelle Wallace.

Class II.—E. E. Duthie, J. A. P. Mair, Mary Helen Milne, Marion Bell Nelson, Margaret Ann Sheed, Clara Henrietta Yunnice.

EDINBURGH.—English :

Class I.—Mary Burns Ambrose, Margaret Clarkson Deas, Marjorie Morris.

Class II.—L. R. M. Brander, Mary Johnston Burnett, J. C. Foster, A. J. Houston, Kathleen Marion Learmonth, W. L. Lindsay, J. Lumsden, Mairi Violet Katherine Mowat, Sheila Murray.

Class III.—Violet Isabella Kemp, Agnes Helen Porteous.

The following Graduate has been admitted to Honours after Graduation :—

Class II.—Jacob Hunter Mowat, M.A.

ERRATA

Page 125, l. 9, *the author's name is Ernest P. Kuhl (not Kuehl).*

„ 196, l. 21, *for wind read mind.*

INDEX

- Act- and Scene-Division in the Plays of Shakespeare*, article by Sir Mark Hunter, 295
- Adam*: see *Antichrist*
- Ambrose, Genevieve, on George Gascoigne, 163
- Ancren Riwle*, origin, date and authorship of the, 82, 197
- Antichrist and Adam*, trans. S. F. Barrow and W. H. Hulme, noticed, 497
- Authorship of the Maid's Metamorphosis, The*, article by S. R. Golding, 270
- Autographs, English Literary*, reviewed, 100
- Bacon, James, will of, 39
- Bacon, Sir Nicholas, letter from Gascoigne to him, 39
- Baker, E. A., review by, 360
- Batho, Edith C., *Summary of Periodical Literature*, 249; review by, 496
- Bibliographies, A Register of*, reviewed, 368
- Bibliography of Samuel Johnson, A*, by W. P. Courtney and D. Nichol Smith, reviewed, 105
- Birch, Sixt, and Henry Medwall*, article by A. W. Reed, 411
- Black Prince, the Earl of Orrery's*, 206
- Boas, F. S., on Sir Sidney Lee, 318; his *Year's Work in English Studies* (1924) reviewed, 376
- Booksellers, enterprise of, in eighteenth century, 433 sqq.
- Boyes, Edward, and Elizabeth Breton (Gascoigne), 37, 166, 171
- Boyle, Roger: see *Orrery*
- Brave Irishman*, T. Sheridan's, 346
- Breton, Elizabeth, 36, 166, 171
- Breton, Nicholas and Richard, 36 sqq., 167
- Breton, William, will of, 36, 166; inquisition P.M. 37, 167
- Brett-Smith, H. F. B., letter on the imprint of C. L. Stainer's book on the Drummond "Conversations," 219; his edition of Peacock reviewed, 471
- British Drama, Songs from*, reviewed, 373
- British Museum, Research at the, 63
- Brooke, Henry, his *Gustavus Vasa*, 99
- Brown, J. E., his *Critical Opinions of Samuel Johnson* reviewed, 354
- Buck, H. S., his *Study in Smollett* reviewed, 360
- Buckinghamshire, The Place-Names of*, by A. Mawer and F. M. Stenton (Place-Name Society), reviewed, 369
- Burton the Anatomist*, ed. G. C. F. Mead and R. C. Clift, noticed, 248
- Byrne, M. St. Clare, her *Elizabethan Home* reviewed, 111; her *Elizabethan Life in Town and Country* reviewed, 244; review by, 474
- Byron, *Ruskin and others on*, by R. W. Chambers, noticed, 247
- Cabinet of Characters, A.*, by Gwendolen Murphy, reviewed, 481
- Campagnac, Prof. E. T., his *Mulcaster's Elementarie* reviewed, 365
- Canon of Swift, The: a Late Addition*, note by Harold Willicms, 322
- Capell, Edward, notes on, 174-6
- Cary, Henry Francis, *Life* by R. W. King reviewed, 486
- Cary, John, Engraver, etc.*, by Sir Herbert George Fordham, reviewed, 367
- Case, Prof. Arthur E., note on Pope and Mary Chandler, 343, 466
- Chambers, Prof. R. W., on the *Ancren Riwle*, 85, 198; his *Ruskin (and others) on Byron*, 247

- Chandler, Mary, and Pope, 343, 466
 Chapman, R. W., note on Brooke's *Gustavus Vasa*, 99; on Johnson's Letters to Taylor, 89, 466; on Johnson's Letters to Perkins, 97; on Johnson's *Plan of a Dictionary*, 216; on Dr. Johnson and Dr. Taylor, 338; letter on *The Oxford Book of English Prose*, 348; reviews by, 348, 354, 471
Chapter in the Early Life of Shakespeare, A: Polesworth in Arden, by Arthur Gray, reviewed, 479
 Chaucer, his *Complaints of Mars and of Venus*, article by G. H. Cowling, 405; his seven-line stanza (dates of poems in this stanza), 311; "Satalye" (C. T. Prol. 58) explained, 346; *Five Hundred Years of Chaucer Criticism* reviewed, 232
 Child, Harold, article on revivals of English dramatic works, 1919-1925 .. 177
 Circulating libraries in the eighteenth century, 292
 Clapton, G. T., his *Selected Letters of Charles Lamb* reviewed, 119
 Clark, W. S., article on the published but unacted "Heroic Plays" of the Earl of Orrery, 280; note on Orrery's heroic plays, 206; on his *Generall*, 459
 Coggeshall, musician (1648), 420
 Collins, A. S., article on the reading public in eighteenth century, 284, 428
 Colloquial idiom, development of, in eighteenth century, 70, 189
Comic Spirit in Restoration Drama, The, by H. T. E. Perry, reviewed, 108
Comparison of Inequality, The, by G. W. Small, reviewed, 241
 Congreve, William, and the South Sea Company, 345; *Comedies*, ed. B. Dobrée, noticed, 247
Congreve Holograph, A, note by W. J. Lawrence, 345
 Cooke, H., musician (1648), 420
 Copyright in the eighteenth century, 433 *seq.*
 Courtney, W. P., his *Bibliography of Samuel Johnson* reviewed, 105
 Cowley, Abraham, his *Discourse concerning Style*, article by Prof. Arthur H. Nethercot, 385
 Cowling, G. H., article on Chaucer's *Complaints of Mars and of Venus*, 405; article on Chaucer's stanza, 311
 Cross, Prof. Wilbur L., his *Life of Sterne* reviewed, 356
Cry of Caleys, The, a song, 460
 Daniel, Samuel, his supposed visit to France in 1584-86 .. 98
 Davis, B. E. C., review by, 372
 Day, T., musician (1648), 420
Dean Swift and Ecclesiastical Preference, article by Sir Charles Firth, 1
Death of George Gascoigne, The, article by B. M. Ward, 169
 Dekker, Thomas, his *Plague Pamphlets*, ed. F. P. Wilson, reviewed, 474
 "Delia," the name, 160
Development of English Colloquial Idiom during the Eighteenth Century, The, article by Joan Platt, 70, 189
De Vera Nobilitate, Sixt Birck's, 411
 Dickens, Bruce, note on the *Peterborough Annal* for 1137 .. 341
Dictionary of Modern English Usage, A, by H. W. Fowler, reviewed, 490
 Donne, John, L. I. Bredvold on, reviewed, 475
 Doughty, Oswald, article on the English malady of the eighteenth century, 257; on Pope and Mary Chandler, 343
Dramatic Revivals, 1919-1925, article by Harold Child, 177
 Drew, musician (1648), 420
 Drummond, William (of Hawthornden) genuineness of "Conversations" with Ben Jonson, 42
 Dublin, early Shakespearian representations in, 92
Early Shakespearian Representations in Dublin, note by W. H. Grattan Flood, 92
 East, Michael (c. 1580-1648), 416
Editors at Work and Play, article by W. W. Greg, 173
 Eighteenth Century, English colloquial idiom in the, 70, 189; the reading public in the, 284, 428

- Elizabethan Home, The*, by M. St. Clare Byrne, reviewed, 111
- Elizabethan Life in Town and Country*, by M. St. Clare Byrne, reviewed, 244
- Elizabethan orthography, notes on, 204; song-composers, lives of, article by Cecil S. Emden, 416; sonneteers and their predecessors, 423; sonnet-sequences, names of the heroines of, 159
- Elton, Prof. Oliver: *see* *Essays and Studies*
- Emden, Cecil S., article on the lives of some Elizabethan song-composers, 416
- Emerson, Prof. O. F., article on originality in Old English poetry, 18
- Encyclopédie, The*, indebted to Johnson, 335
- England's Helicon* (reprint) reviewed, 245
- Englische Volkscharakter, Der*, by Karl Wildhagen, reviewed, 118
- English Association, *Essays and Studies*, Vol. XI. reviewed, 372; *The Year's Work* (1924) reviewed, 376
- English Literary Autographs, 1550-1650*, reviewed, 100
- English Malady of the Eighteenth Century, The*, article by Oswald Doughty, 257
- English Novel, The*, by Hugh Walpole, reviewed, 113
- English Place-Name Society: *see* Buckinghamshire, 31
- Epigram, Martial and the English*, reviewed, 120
- Erondell, Peter, 111
- Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association, Vol. XI.*, collected by O. Elton, reviewed, 392
- Evans, L., musician (1648), 420
- "Ey" for "Ay" in Elizabethan spelling, 204
- Fell, John, the types of, 495
- Fenix*, originality in, 18
- Field, L., review by, 373
- Firth, Sir Charles H., article on Dean Swift and ecclesiastical preferment, 1; note on a story from *Gulliver's Travels*, 340; on George Wither, 457
- Fischer, Prof. Rudolf, his *Shakespeares Sonnette* reviewed, 350; his views on Shakespeare's sonnets discussed, 440
- Five Hundred Years of Chaucer Criticism and Allusion, 1357-1900*, by Caroline F. E. Spurgeon, reviewed, 232
- Flasdieck, Prof. Hermann M., his *Mittelenglische Originalurkunden* reviewed, 488
- Flood, W. H. Grattan, note on early Shakespearian representations in Dublin, 92; on Samuel Daniel, 98; on St. Cecilia's Day, 1686, 218; on T. Sheridan's *Brave Irishman*, 346; on three fifteenth-century songs, 460
- Florio, John, date of his second marriage, 218
- Flos Florum*, a song, 460
- Flower, Robin, reviews by, 100, 230
- Ford, Thomas (d. 1648), will of, 419
- Fordham, Sir H. George, his *John Cary* reviewed, 367
- Fort, J. A., article on Thorpe's text of Shakespeare's sonnets, 439
- Fowler, H. W., his *Dictionary of Modern English Usage* reviewed, 490
- Fox, J., musician (1650), 422
- Fulgens and Lucret*, 411
- Further Light upon the Heroic Plays of Roger Boyle, Earl of Orrery*, note by W. S. Clark, 206
- Further Research upon the "Ancrén Riuele"*, notes by Fr. Vincent M'Nabb, Prof. R. W. Chambers, and Fr. Herbert Thurston, 82, 197
- Gascoigne, George, and his *Circle*, article by B. M. Ward, 32; discussed by G. Ambrose, 163
- Gascoigne, George, article by Genevieve Ambrose, 163; reply by B. M. Ward, 170
- Gascoigne, George, death of, 37, 169
- Gascoigne, Sir John, Will and Inquisition P. M. of, 32, 34, 163-164
- Generall*, the Earl of Orrery's, 207, 459
- Geoffrey of Monmouth and the *Vita Merlini*, 230
- Golding, S. R., article on the authorship of the *Maid's Metamorphosis*, 270
- Goldsmith, Oliver, early literary relations with Thomas Percy, 51;

- influence of Percy on his *Citizen of the World*, 53, 454; the *Percy Memoir*, 51, 455
- Gordon, Prof. George, his *Medium Aevum and the Middle Age* noticed, 115
- Goring, George, Thomas Randolph's *Epithalamium* to, 146
- Grainger, James, and Thomas Percy, 51, 446
- Granville-Barker, H., his edition of *Julius Caesar* reviewed, 220; his *From Henry V. to Hamlet*, 246
- Grattan, J. H. G., his *Our Living Language* reviewed, 242; reviews by, 241, 243, 369, 488
- Gray, Arthur, his *Chapter in the Early Life of Shakespeare* reviewed, 479
- Greg, W. W., article on Ben Jonson's works, 129; article on "Editors at Work and Play," 173; his *English Literary Autographs* reviewed, 100
- Grey, Thomas, *Letters*, ed. J. Beresford, noticed, 247
- Grierson, Prof. H. J. C., review by, 467
- Griffin, B., his *Fidessa*, 424 sqq.
- Grimald, Nicholas, *The Life and Poems of*, by L. R. Merrill, reviewed, 483
- Growth of the Reading Public during the Eighteenth Century*, *The*, article by A. S. Collins, 284, 428
- Gulliver's Travels*, a story from, 340
- Gurrey, F., his *Our Living Language* reviewed, 242
- Gustavus Vasa*, note on, 99
- Haines, C. M., his *Shakespeare in France*, reviewed, 109
- Halliford Peacock*, *The*, Vols. IX.—X., ed. by H. F. B. Brett-Smith and C. E. Jones, reviewed, 471
- Handbook of Present-Day English*, A, Pt. II., by E. Kruisinga, reviewed, 243
- Handwriting, guides to, 65
- Harrison, G. B., review by, 479
- Hau Kiou Chooan*, article by L. F. Powell, 446
- Herford, Prof. C. H., his edition of Ben Jonson, Vols. I. and II., reviewed, 129, 227; his *Year's Work in English Studies* (1924) reviewed, 376
- "Heroic Plays" of the Earl of Orrery, 280
- Historical Outlines of English Phonology and Morphology*, by Prof. Samuel Moore, reviewed, 240
- Hollyband, Claudius, 111
- Hunter, Sir Mark, article on act- and scene-division in Shakespeare, 295; note on *The Tempest* (III. ii. 121), 347; review by, 220
- Husbands, H. Winifred, *Summary of Periodical Literature* by, 121, 249, 377, 498
- "Idea," the name, 161
- Inequality, The Comparison of*, reviewed, 241
- Ingram, E. G., reviews by, 239, 240
- Isaacs, J., note on Shakespeare's dramatic punctuation, 461; review by, 108
- Jack Frenchman's Lamentation*, attributed to Swift, 323
- Jahrbuch der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft*, Bd. 59/60, reviewed, 493
- Jenkinson, Hilary, article on the study of English punctuation of the sixteenth century, 152
- John, Gwen, her *Queen Elizabeth* noticed, 248
- John Rylands Library, Manchester, Catalogue of Bible Exhibition noticed, 497
- Johnson, Samuel, his letters to John Taylor, 89, 466; to John Perkins, 97; his *Plan of a Dictionary*, 216; and the *Encyclopédie*, 335; Johnson and Taylor, 338; *A Bibliography of*, reviewed 105; *The Critical Opinions of*, reviewed, 354; *Selected Letters* noticed, 248
- Jones, C. E., his edition of Peacock reviewed, 471
- Jonson, Ben, ed. Herford and Simpson, Vols. I. and II., 129, 227; his "Conversations" with Drummond, 42
- Julius Caesar*, H. Granville-Barker's edition reviewed, 220
- Keats and Shakespeare*, by J. Middleton Murry, reviewed, 363
- Keller, Wolfgang, his *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, Bd. 59-61, reviewed, 493
- King, R. W., his *Life of H. F. Cary* reviewed, 486

- Kruisinga, E., his *Handbook of Present-Day English*, Pt. II., reviewed, 243
- Lamb, Charles, *Selected Letters* reviewed, 119
- Lambeth, Archbishop Library at, 62, 67
- Latham, George (1650), 422
- Lawrence, W. J., note on a Congreve holograph, 345
- Lee, Sir Sidney, article by F. S. Boas, 318
- Legouis, Pierre, note on Marvell's *Maniban*, 328
- Libraries of London, research at, 68 ; circulating libraries in the eighteenth century, 292 ; parochial libraries, 428
- Linche, R., his *Diella*, 424 sqq.
- Literary Autographs*, English, reviewed, 100
- Literary Research in London*, article by A. W. Reed, 62
- Lives of Elizabethan Song Composers : Some New Facts*, article by Cecil S. Emden, 416
- Lloyd, Bertram, on Elizabethan orthography, 204
- MacCallum, Prof. W. M., his *Dramatic Monologue in the Victorian Period*, 246
- McKerrow, R. B., reviews by, 111, 115, 120, 227, 235, 245, 365, 375, 376, 493
- M'Nabb, Rev. Fr. Vincent, O.P., on the "*Ancren Riwele*," 82, 197
- Maid's Metamorphosis*, *The*, authorship of, 270
- Malone, Edmond, notes on, 173-6
- "*Maniban*," Marvell's, 328
- Marcham, F., note on *The King's Office of the Revels*, 1610-1622..95
- Margoliouth, H. M., note on Andrew Marvell, Senior, 96
- Martial and the English Epigram from Sir Thomas Wyatt to Ben Jonson*, by T. K. Whipple, reviewed, 120
- Marvell, Andrew (Senior), autograph sermon by, 96
- Marvell, Andrew, his "grammatomantist," *Maniban*, 328
- Matrons*, *The*, by T. Percy, 58, 455
- Mawer, Prof. Allen, his *Place-Names of Buckinghamshire* reviewed, 369 ; review by, 242
- Maydens of London*, a song, 460
- Medieval Academy of America, *The*, 375
- Medium Aevum and the Middle Age*, by Prof. George Gordon, reviewed, 115
- Medwall, Henry, and Sixt Birck, 411
- Merlin, *The Vita Merlini*, ed. J. J. Parry, reviewed, 230
- Merrill, L. R., his *Life and Poems of Nicholas Grimald* reviewed, 483
- Merritt, Percival, his *Piozzi Marginalia* reviewed, 354
- "Middle Ages," origin of the term, 115
- Milner-Barry, Alda, article on *Oliver Goldsmith and Thomas Percy* by, 51 ; discussed by L. F. Powell, 446
- Milton, John, J. H. Hanford's studies of, reviewed, 475
- Minor Elizabethan Sonneteers and their Greater Predecessors*, article by Janet G. Scott, 423
- Mittelenglische Originalurkunden* (1405-1430), by H. M. Flasdieck, reviewed, 488
- Moore, Prof. S., his *Historical Outlines of English Phonology and Morphology* reviewed, 240
- Morley, Prof. Edith J., review by, 363
- Moseley, Humphrey (1650), 422
- Mulcaster's Elementarie*, ed. E. T. Campagnac, reviewed, 365
- Murphy, Gwendolen, her *Cabinet of Characters* reviewed, 481
- Murry, John Middleton, his *Keats and Shakespeare* reviewed, 363
- Names of the Heroines of Elizabethan Sonnet-Sequences*, *The*, article by Janet G. Scott, 159
- Nethercot, Prof. Arthur H., article on *Cowley's Discourse Concerning Style*, 385
- Northup, C. S., his *Register of Bibliographies* reviewed, 368
- Note on Chaucer's Stanza, A*, article by G. H. Cowling, 311
- Note on the Early Literary Relations of Oliver Goldsmith and Thomas Percy, A*, by Alda Milner-Barry, 51

- Note on Shakespeare's Dramatic Punctuation, A*, by J. Isaacs, 461
- Notes on the Study of English Punctuation of the Sixteenth Century*, by Hilary Jenkinson, 152
- Old English Grammar* (3rd edition), by J. Wright and E. M. Wright, reviewed, 239
- Originality in Old English Poetry*, article by Prof. O. F. Emerson, 18
- Orrery, The Earl of, his published but unacted "Heroic Plays" (article by W. S. Clark), 280; note on his heroic plays, 206; his play *The Black Prince*, 206; *The Generall*, 207, 459
- Our Living Language*, by J. H. G. Grattan and F. Gurrey, reviewed, 242
- Oxford Book of English Prose, The*, ed. by Sir A. Quiller-Couch, reviewed, 235; letter from R. W. Chapman, 348
- "Parthenophe," the name, 159
- Parry, J. J., his edition of the *Vita Merlini* reviewed, 230
- Peacock, Thomas Love, review of the "Halliford Edition," 471
- Peele, George, as possible author of *The Maid's Metamorphosis*, 270 sqq.
- Peerson, Martin (fl. 1636), 421
- Percy, Thomas, his *Hau Kiou Chooan*, 52, 446; his literary relations with Oliver Goldsmith, 51; his *Matrons*, 58, 455; the *Percy Memoir*, 51, 455
- Periodical Literature, Summary of*, 121, 249, 377, 498
- Perkins, John, Johnson's letters to, 97
- Perry, Prof. Henry Ten Eyck, his *Comic Spirit in Restoration Drama* reviewed, 108
- Peterborough Annal for 1137, The*, note by Bruce Dickens, 341
- "Phillis," the name, 160
- Phœnix, The*, originality in, 18
- Phonology and Morphology, English, Historical Outlines of*, reviewed, 240
- Pilkington, Francis (c. 1563-1638), 420
- Piozzi Marginalia*, by Percival Merritt, reviewed, 354
- Place-Name Society: see Buckinghamshire
- Plague Pamphlets of Thomas Dekker, The*, ed. F. P. Wilson, reviewed, 474
- Platt, Joan, article on the development of English colloquial idiom during the eighteenth century, 70, 189
- Players' Shakespeare, The: The Tragedie of Julius Cæsar*, ed. by Harley Granville-Barker, reviewed, 200: see *Julius Cæsar*
- Plays, revivals of early, 177
- Pollard, Prof. A. W., reviews by, 119, 495
- Pons, Prof. E., his *Thème de la Nature dans la Poésie anglo-saxonne* reviewed, 496
- Pope*, by Lytton Strachey, reviewed, 113
- Pope and Mary Chandler*, notes by Arthur E. Case and O. Doughty, 343
- Porter, W., composer (c. 1590-1659), 420
- Powell, L. F., on John Florio, 218; on Johnson and the *Encyclopédie*, 335; article on *Hau Kiou Chooan*, 446
- Pownall, N., singer (1650), 422
- Praz, Mario, his *Seicentismo e Marinismo in Inghilterra*, reviewed, 467
- Present-Day English, A Handbook of*, Pt. II, reviewed, 243
- Prototype of Walter Shandy's Tristram's*, *The*, note by John M. Turnbull, 212
- Published but Unacted "Heroic Plays" of Roger Boyle, Earl of Orrery, The*, article by W. S. Clark, 280
- Punctuation in the sixteenth century, 152
- Quiller-Couch, Sir Arthur, his *Oxford Book of English Prose* reviewed, 235
- Randolph, Thomas, his *Epithalamium to George Goring*, article by G. C. Moore-Smith, 146
- Reading Public in the Eighteenth Century, The*, 284, 428
- Reed, A. W., article on Literary Research in London, 62; article on Sixt Birck and Henry Medwall, 411; reviews by, 105, 109, 113, 232, 368, 481, 483

- Reed, E. B., his *Songs from the British Drama* reviewed, 373
- Register of Bibliographies of the English Language and Literature, A*, by C. S. Northup, reviewed, 368
- Research, see Literary Research
- Restoration Drama, The Comic Spirit in*, reviewed, 108
- Revels, The King's Office of the* (note by F. Marcham), 95
- Revivals of English Dramatic Works, 1919-25*, article by Harold Child, 177
- Rhodes, Crompton, his views on Shakespeare's act- and scene-division discussed, 304 sqq.
- Rose, William, review by, 118
- Ruud, Prof. Martin B., note on "she," 201
- St. Cecilia's Day*, 1686, note by W. H. Grattan Flood, 218
- Satalye (Chaucer, C. T. Prol. 58)*, note by W. B. Sedgwick, 346
- Saul, The Tragedy of King*, 1703, attributed to the Earl of Orrery, 282
- Scott, Janet G., article on the names of heroines of Elizabethan sonnet-sequences, 159; article on Elizabethan sonneteers 423
- Sedgwick, W. B., on "Satalye," 346
- Seicentismo e Marinismo in Inghilterra*, by Mario Praz, reviewed, 467
- Selected Letters of Charles Lamb*, ed. G. T. Clapton, reviewed, 119
- Selincourt, Prof. E. de, review by, 486
- Shadwell and the operatic "Tempest"*, note by D. M. Walmsley, 463
- Shakespeare, act- and scene-division in, 295; punctuation in, 461, 475; early representations in Dublin, 92; French criticism of, 109; *Julius Caesar*, ed. H. Granville-Barker, 220; *The Tempest* (III, ii. 121), 347; the operatic version of *The Tempest*, 463; Thorpe's text of the Sonnets (article by J. A. Fort), 439; *A Chapter in the Early Life of S.*, 479; *Studies in S.*, by O. J. Campbell and C. C. Friers, reviewed, 475; *S. in France*, by C. M. Haines, reviewed, 109; *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, Vols. 59-61, reviewed, 493; *Shakespeare's Sonnet*, by Prof. Rudolf Fischer, reviewed and discussed, 350, 440; *Keats and Shakespeare*, by J. M. Murry, reviewed, 363; *From Henry V. to Hamlet*, by H. Granville-Barker, noticed, 246; *A Shakespeare Reference Library*, 247; *Catalogue of Books, etc. at Shakespeare's Birthplace* noticed, 247
- Shandy, Walter, the prototype of his *Tristram's*, 212
- "Shay" (or "Shey") for "Say" in Elizabethan spelling, 204
- "She" *Once More*, note by Prof. Martin B. Ruud, 201
- Sheridan, Thomas, his *Brave Irishman*, 346
- Sidgwick, F., review by, 490
- Simpson, Percy, article on the Drummond "Conversations," 42; his edition of Ben Jonson, Vols. I. and II., reviewed, 129, 227
- Sixt Birch and Henry Medwall*, "De Vera Nobilitate," article by A. W. Reed, 411
- Sixteenth Century punctuation, notes on the study of, 152
- Small, G. W., his *Comparison of Inequality* reviewed, 241
- Smith, D. Nichol, his *Bibliography of Samuel Johnson* reviewed, 105
- Smith, Prof. G. C. Moore, article on Randolph's *Epithalamium to George Goring*, 146
- Smith, W., his *Chloris*, 424 sqq.
- Smollett, *A Study in*, by H. S. Buck, reviewed, 360
- Society for Pure English, Tracts XIX. and XXI., reviewed, 115
- Some Notes on Ben Jonson's Works*, article by W. W. Greg, 129
- Songs from the British Drama*, by E. B. Reed, reviewed, 373
- Sonnets, Elizabethan, sources of, 423 sqq.
- Specimens of Books printed at Oxford with the types given to the University by John Fell* reviewed, 495
- Speculum*, Vol. I. No. 1, reviewed, 375
- Spenser, Edmund, and Ireland, 456
- Spleen in Eighteenth Century England, 257
- Spurgeon, Prof. Caroline F. E., her

- Five Hundred Years of Chaucer Criticism and Allusion* reviewed, 232
 Stage directions in Shakespeare, 295
 Stainer, C. L., his book on the Drummond "Conversations," 44, 219
 Steevens, George, notes on, 176
 "Stella," the name, 159
 Stenton, F. M., his *Place-Names of Buckinghamshire* reviewed, 369
 Sterne, Laurence, note on Walter Shandy's *Tristrapædia*, 212; *Life of*, by Prof. W. L. Cross, reviewed, 356
 Stobart, J. C., review by, 244
Story from "Gulliver's Travels," A, note by Sir Charles H. Firth, 340
 Strachey, Lytton, his *Pope* reviewed, 113
Studies in Shakespeare, Milton and Donne (Univ. of Michigan), reviewed, 475
Study in Smollett, A, by H. S. Buck, reviewed, 360
Summary of Periodical Literature, by H. Winifred Husbands and E. C. Batho, 121, 249, 377, 498
 Swift, Jonathan, and ecclesiastical pre-ferment (article by Sir Charles H. Firth), 1; and *Jack Frenchman's Lamentation*, 323; a story from *Gulliver's Travels*, 340
 Taylor, Dr. John, and Dr. Johnson, 338; Johnson's letters to, 89, 466
Tempest, The (operatic version), 463
Tempest, The, III. ii., 121.. 347
Thorpe's Text of Shakespeare's Sonnets, article by J. A. Fort, 439
Three Fifteenth-Century Songs, note by W. H. Grattan Flood, 460
 Thurston, Rev. Fr. Herbert, S.J., on the *Ancien Rituel*, 89, 199
 Tomkins, Thomas (1572-c. 1650), 418
Trajectory of King Saul, The, see *Saul*
Translator of Dante, The: The Life, etc., of H. F. Cary, by R. W. King, reviewed, 486
Tristrapædia, the prototype of, 212
Tristram Shandy: see Sterne, L.
 Turnbull, John M., on the prototype of Walter Shandy's *Tristrapædia*, 212; review by, 356
Two Notes on Elizabethan Orthography, by Bertram Lloyd, 204
University Examination Results, 1926.. 506
Vita Merlini, The, ed. by J. J. Parry, reviewed, 230
 Walker, Dr. Obadiah, Sterne's plagiarism from, 212
 Walmsley, D. M., note on Shadwell and the operatic *Tempest*, 463
 Walpole, Hugh, his *English Novel* reviewed, 113
 Ward, B. M., article on George Gascoigne and his circle, 32; on the death of George Gascoigne, 169
Was Samuel Daniel in France in 1584-86? note by W. H. Grattan Flood, 98
 Whetstone, George, his allusions to Gascoigne, 33 sqq., 169
 Whipple, T. K., his *Martial and the English Epigram* reviewed, 120
 Wildhagen, Prof. Karl, his *Englische Volkscharakter* reviewed, 118
 Williams, Harold, note on the canon of Swift, 322
 Wilson, F. P., note on Spenser and Ireland, 456; his *Plague Pamphlets of Thomas Dekker* reviewed, 474
 Wilson, Prof. J. Dover, his views on Shakespeare's act- and scene-division discussed, 303 sqq.; reviews by, 350, 475
 Wither, George, his advertisement of a lost MS., 458; letter of, 458
 Wormald, E., musician (1648), 420
 Wright, Prof. Joseph, and Elizabeth M. Wright, their *Old English Grammar* reviewed, 239
 Wooldridge, S. W., review of Fordham's *John Cary*, 367
Year's Work in English Studies, The, Vol. V., 1924, ed. Boas and Herford, reviewed, 376

,
,
,
's
ll
el
a-
he
4-
d,
to
the
che
of
and
lets
on
ivi-
by,
of
M.
mar
ord-
The,
ord,